

---

# IMPRIMATUR,

Liber cui Titulus, [*A Vindication of Some Protestant Principles, of Church-Unity, &c.*]

Nov. 16. 1687.

Guil. Needham R<sup>mo</sup>. in Chri-  
sto P. D. Wilhelmo Ar-  
chiep. Cant. a Sacris

---

---

# IMPRIMATUR,

Liber cui Titulus, [*A Vindication of Some Protestant Principles, of Church-Unity, &c.*]

Nov. 16. 1687.

Guil. Needham R<sup>mo</sup>. in Chri-  
sto P. D. Wilhelmo Ar-  
chiep. Cant. a Sacris

---



A/23

VINDICATION  
OF SOME  
Protestant Principles  
OF

Church-Unity and Catholick-Communion,

From the Charge of Agreement with the

CHURCH of ROME.

IN ANSWER

To a late PAMPHLET, Intituled, *An Agreement  
between the Church of ENGLAND and the  
Church of ROME, evinced from the Concer-  
tation of some of her Sons with their Brethren  
the Dissenters.*

---

By WILLIAM SHERLOCK, D.D.

Master of the TEMPLE.

---

LONDON:

Printed for William Rogers, at the Sun over-against  
St. Dunstan's Church, in Fleet-street, 1688.

A  
 VINDICATION  
 OF SOME  
 Dissenting Principles

Church-Unity and Catholic-Communion  
 from the Charge of Agreement with the  
 CHURCH of ROME.  
 IN ANSWER  
 To a late PAMPHLET, Intituled, An Agreement  
 between the Church of ENGLAND and the  
 Church of ROME, coined from the Concer-  
 tation of some of her Sons with their Brethren  
 the Dissenters.

BY WILLIAM SWERLOCK, D.D.  
 Master of the TEMPLE.

LONDON:  
 Printed for William Rogers, at the Sun over-against  
 St Dunstons-Church, in Fleetstreet, 1688.

---

TO THE  
READER.

**I** HERE Present thee with a Book which the Importunity of our *Roman* Adversaries has extorted from me ; I had rather have employed my Pen upon some more useful Argument ; but in such a state as this, we cannot always be our own Chusers. The Design of the Book I Answer seems to be, To revive some Old Disputes between us and the Dissenters, and to raise New Jealousies in them, if not of our Inclination to Popery, yet of a great deal of Popish Leaven yet remaining among us, which

*To the Reader.*

which ought to be purged out ; for there is nothing such men dread more, than that the Dissenters should at this time entertain any kind Thoughts of the Church of *England*. The Plot, I confess, is well enough laid, were not all Wise Men of both Parties aware of it, and that makes it ridiculous enough ; and indeed the Book it self is an odd kind of mixture ; he gives very good words to the Dissenters, and at the same time uses no other but their own Arguments against the Church of *England*, to establish some main Points of Popery, which whether it be a piece of Courtship to them, or a sly Affront, ought to be considered : As for our Agreement with the Church of *Rome*, if I have not sufficiently baffled that Pretence, I will never write more ; but this of it self was too mean a Design to confute that which no body, not the  
Ob-

*To the Reader.*

Objector himself, believed ; and therefore I will be bold to say, that I have abundantly confuted the Popish Supremacy from those very Principles on which this Author would found our Agreement ; I intended a Preface to have explained some Notions about the Church, which might have been of use to ordinary Readers for the better understanding this Answer, but it swell'd so much upon my hands, that by the advice of some Friends I have reserved it for a distinct Treatise, which shall quickly follow.

*W. S.*

*A Vin*



Opinion himself believed; and therefore  
I will be bold to say, that I have aban-  
doned the Popish Supremacy  
from those very Principles on which  
this Author would found our Right-  
ment; I intended a Plea to have ex-  
plained some Notions about the  
Church, which might have been of use  
to ordinary Readers for the better un-  
derstanding this Answer, but it would  
do much upon my hands, that by the  
advice of some Friends I have reserved  
it for a distinct Treatise, which shall  
quickly follow.

W. S.

Am Vm



AN  
ANSWER  
TO THE  
PREFACE.

**S**INCE this Author has thought fit to single me out, as an example of this pretended Agreement between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, I shall undertake my own defence, which will give me no other trouble, but a short diversion from some better designs; which I suppose is all that was hoped for from this Pamphlet.

For whoever this Author be (which I am not curious to know) I cannot think him so weak, as to hope at this time of Day, that he could perswade our Dissenters, *That the Clergy of the Church of England, are not the Chief, if not the only Opposers of Popery, and Defenders of the Protestant Religion; or that, notwithstanding all their appearing Zeal against Popery, they are still Papists in their hearts, and are ready to embrace a Cassandrian accommodation whenever the Government pleases; and therefore I could be very well contented*

*such*

*An Answer to the Preface.*

such suggestions as these should pass without an Answer, as far as I am concerned in them; for let any man that knows me, think me a *Papist* if he can; I am pretty confident, this Author believes me far enough from him; but it is fit, that such little arts as these should be exposed to the scorn and contempt of Mankind, and that our Dissenters should be made sensible what a mean Opinion such Writers have of them, who hope to impose upon them by such mean arts. For to begin with that *great Cry of late*, that *the Clergy of the Church of England are now the Chief, if not the only opposers of Popery, and Defenders of the Protestant Religion*; Is there not good reason for it? Have they not defended the Church of England against all the little arts and shifts of the Church of Rome? What is that then which he calls *the unlucky mistake*, and which *the un wary Readers of Books* are to be warned against? That those unanswerable Books, which have of late been written against Popery, were not written by the Clergy of the Church of England? That he dares not say. What is the *mistake* then? That these men, who confute Popery, are not *Protestants*, but *Papists*? Methinks their confuting Popery is no great sign of their being *Papists*; especially when *Papists* are not able to defend their Religion against them. I am sure, if their Arguments will keep men from turning *Papists*, they are notable opposers of Popery, and defenders of the *Protestant Religion*, whatever they are themselves; and what hurt it would do any man to be confirmed in the *Protestant Religion*, though it were by the Writings of concealed *Papists*. I cannot guess. Should the Pope himself write a Book against Popery, if the Arguments were good, I should like the Book never the

the worse for the sake of the Author. I deny not, but such things may be done; *Papists* may write against Popery, and *Protestants* for it, with an intention to betray the Cause which they undertake to defend; but if this were his rule of guessing, there would be much more just cause to suspect, that our late Popish Writers were *Protestants*, than that our *Protestant* Writers were *Papists*. When they are able to Answer their Books against Popery, we will give them leave to call them *Papists* still; but could they have done that, they would have allowed them to have been *Protestants* still.

But what course does our Author take to *undeceive* unwary Readers at this time, and to prove these Confuters of Popery to be *Papists*? Why, by acquainting them with the avowed Principles of some of our Clergy about those Points wherein the very life of Popery consists, and on which the whole System of that Religion is founded: In doing which, he hath with some clearness demonstrated the agreement of Opinion between the Church of England men, and the Church of Rome, to be so exact and full, that if the Government should so design, it were but dictum factum, according to their Doctrine; and a *Cassandrian Peace* might be patch'd up presently with Rome. This is a notable discovery indeed! Do any of these men then embrace any Doctrines of the Church of Rome? No; but it seems, they agree with the Church of Rome in some Fundamental Principles, whereon the whole System of Popery is founded; That shall be examined anon: But suppose it at present; Do they draw the same Conclusions from these Principles, which the Church of Rome does? No; but they ought to do so: so this Author thinks; But suppose they do not think so; Are they ever the nearer Popery, though their Principles be the same,

## An Answer to the Preface.

same, if their Conclusions are as distant as Protestantism is from Popery? If they be so well disposed to a *Cassandrian Peace*, I pray, What hinders it? Won't, they receive us upon these terms? What? Not after all their softning representations to invite men into the bosom of the Church? When they are so fond of all new Converts, will they reject the *Cassandrian Divines* of the Church of England? When he adds, *That his Majesty will admit of no such accomodations*, any one would suspect that these poor *Cassandrians* had been suing for reconciliations, and had been rejected; that the mollifying character, of a *Papist truly represented*, and the Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Catholick Faith, which is as soft, though not so honest, as *Cassanders* consultation, would not now be allowed of at Court, and all for the sake of that *more glorious design of Liberty of Conscience*. But why might not *Cassandrians* be reconciled to the Church, and Dissenters have their Liberty too? This Prefacer does not tell his Story well; he has Forehead enough, but wants somewhat within.

Well, but it was necessary in this present juncture to put some check to the insulting Talk of the Clergy, who would be thought to be the only Champions against Popery: That the Clergy of the Church of England, have industriously and successfully opposed the Corruptions of the Church of Rome, will be acknowledged by all but *Papists*, and they feel it to their cost; but that they are the only Champions against Popery, I assure you, is not pleasing to them, for they would be very glad to see their dissenting Brethren put to their helping Hand, and be as industrious to preserve those from Popery, who have a Veneration for their Authority, as we are; and upon these terms we could heartily

heartily forgive them all their former unjust imputations of Popery to us ; but that our Popish Adversaries find it necessary in this juncture to give some check to this Popery-opposing Clergy, I do not wonder, and I believe no body will, tho methinks the best way of giving a check to their Brags, had been to confute their Books, and they had work enough before them, had they liked this way ; for I can tell them a great many Books which they have never answered yet, and I beleive never will, I am sure never can to any purpose : But they come too late to perswade people now that we are Papists, especially when they are so open-hearted as to tell all the World what their design is ; for if we were Papists, no man will believe that they would be the first men who would discover us ; it may be they may know some few *Cassandrian* Church-men, but those they keep to themselves yet, and leave others to guess at them.

But what *Check* does he intend to give to this *Insulting Talk of the Clergy* ? A very terrible one truly ; for from this *Essay*, it is pretty evident, *That the Church of England must either freely declare, that as to the particulars instanced in, she is agreed with the Romanist, and that the Controversie lies only between the Church of Rome and the Protestant Dissenter ; or she must honestly renounce the Principles she has cleav'd unto, when any of her Sons wrote against the Nonconformists, and confess that she has been persecuting them for their firm adherence to Protestant Doctrines.* This is to triumph before the Victory, as our Author will quickly find ; but however, for my part, I am glad it is no worse ; for I do not see how this will much humble us with relation to our Disputes against Popery : Should I find any Principles that ever I have maintain'd against Dissenters, give any advantage to Popery, I would certainly conclude them to be false, and make



## An Answer to the Preface.

make no scruple at all to renounce them; for that which is false cannot follow from that which is true; and how great a humiliation soever this were, a man might dispute heartily against Popery still; and let them but lay the charge of Persecution upon this issue, which I grant is the true and fair state of the Case, (for Persecution is only for Righteousness sake) and if our Dissenters were in the right, I will readily grant that those who made or executed those Laws against Dissenters, who had any hand or heart in it, were guilty of Persecution. There may be unreasonable severities used upon other accounts, but every man who suffers for following his Conscience, is not therefore persecuted; but he who suffers for being in the right, for believing and doing what God commands.

The next discovery this Essay makes is this, *That ever since the breach between the Church of England, and the Protestant Dissenter has had its being, we have left us nothing but the Name, the Shadow of a Protestant Church of England, and that so far as she differs from the Dissenter, she agrees with the Roman Catholick.* How glad would these Gentlemen be, to have none thought Protestants but Dissenters, who in this present juncture are a more gentle and better natur'd sort of Protestants, than this *Shadow of the Church of England*, which haunts them like a Ghost or Spectre: But when did the Church of England commence such a mere Name and Shadow? Ever since the breach with the Protestant Dissenter. But is not the Church of England the same now that it was before that breach? And if it were a good substantial Protestant Church then, How comes it to be a Shadow now? Suppose what he says were true, *That as far as we differ from the Protestant Dissenter, we agree with the Roman Catholick.* The Church of England may be never the worse Protestant Church for that, which is plac-

ed



eed in the middle, between two Extreams, the Dissenter and the Papist. The Church of *England* Reformers never made a mere Opposition to the Church of *Rome*, the Rule of their Reformation, but Reformed only those abuses of the Church of *Rome* which needed a Reformation; and when this Prefacer can prove that we have not Reformed enough, we will Reform again; for we are not obstinate against convictions, and never think it too late to Reform; however, if as far as we differ from the Dissenter, we are *Roman* Catholicks, yet certainly, as far as we agree with the Dissenter, we are not; and that is enough to make us somewhat more than the Shadow of a Protestant Church. For we agree with them in our opposition to the Popes Supremacy, (as will presently appear) to Infallibility, to Transubstantiation, to the Sacrifice of the Mass, to the Adoration of the Host, to the Worship of Saints and Angels, and the *Virgin Mary*, to the Worship of Images, to Prayers in an unknown Tongue, to the denying People the use of the Bible, to the Five new Popish Sacraments, to Indulgencies, Purgatory, Prayers for the Dead, the Merit of Works, and such like Popish Innovations and Corruptions; and to oppose these I take to be good substantial Protestantcy. And as for those things wherein we differ from the Dissenters, we are so far from being *Roman*-Catholicks, that as for my own part, tho I like neither, yet I think the Dissenter the better of the two: setting aside the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, I should prefer any form of Government, Presbytery, or Independancy, rather than a Papal Monarchy; it were better to have no Ceremonies at all, than to see Religion transform'd into little else but outside and Ceremony; for some external Indecencies of Worship, which may be supplied by inward Devotions, are more eligible than gross and palpable

ble Superstitions. Though I think sitting at the Lords Supper favours of too much irreverence, yet I had rather see men Receive sitting, than see them Worship the Host.

So that our Church of *England* Nobility and Gentry, as he adds, have no reason either to embrace the name of *Roman* Catholick, or to close with the Protestant Dissenter; a Church of *England* Protestant is somewhat more than a name still, and I hope will be so, when some other names will be forgot.

we differ from the Dissenters as we agree with the Catholics; we are not so much as they are, and that is enough to make us somewhat more than the shadow of a Protestant Church. For we agree with them in our opposition to the Popes supremacy, (as will presently appear) to infallibility, to Tradition, to the sacrifice of the Mass, to the Adoration of the Host, to the Worship of Saints and Angels, and the Virgin Mary, to the Worship of Images, to the use of the Bible, to the two new Popish sacraments, to Indulgences, Purgatory, Prayers for the Dead, the Merit of Works, and such like Popish Innovations and Corruptions; and to oppose these I take to be good the Natural Protestant. And as for those things which we differ from the Dissenters, as to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, that as for my own part, I like neither you I think should alter the better of the two, and under the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, I should prefer a State of Government, Presbyterian or Independent; and as for the Ministry, I think better to have no Ceremonies at all, than to let Religion transform'd into little but outside and Ceremony; for some external Inducements of Worship which may be useful by way of Discipline, are more likely to be lost than gain'd.

and u  
them  
can n

---

A N  
**A N S W E R**  
 TO THE  
**PRETENDED AGREEMENT**  
 Between the  
**CHURCH of ENGLAND,**  
 AND THE  
**CHURCH of ROME.**

And First to the  
**INTRODUCTION.**

**H**E begins with an Account of that late Dispute about *Representing and Misrepresenting*, which if he had been wise he would have forgot; *The Papists* (he says) *complain of Misrepresentation, and until this be yielded, they'l not Dispute.* And I commend them for their Resolution, which is the wisest thing they can now do, tho it had been wiser not to have complain-  
 C ed

ed; for they complained as long as they could; and now they have no more to say, They will Dispute no longer; as he observes, *That for some months there has been nothing but Answering, Replying, Rejoyning, and Sur-rejoyning, and we are still where we began*: That is, they are Papiſts ſtill, and we Proteſtants, which I ſuppoſe is all that he can mean; for if they have any modeſty, their complaining, and our trouble of answering is at an end, which I think is not where we began.

Well, ſo much then for *Misrepreſenting*, and now a new Scene opens, *In the firſt place a juſt State of the Controverſie muſt be ſetled, wherein the Contending Parties agree, and how far they differ*. What they pleaſe, we are contented to follow them in their own way; tho it is ſtrange this ſhould be to ſettle now. Our Author undertakes the firſt of theſe, but *does not deſign to encumber this Diſcourſe with a Catalogue of Agreements in the great Doctrines of Chriſtian Religion, and matters of Opinion*. Tho he was more afraid than hurt here, for this would not much have encumbered his Diſcourſe; for I know little we agree in, but the Three Creeds; but his Reaſon why he will not encumber his Diſcourſe with our Agreement in Doctrines and Opinions, is very ſurprizing, *viz. becauſe there is no need of Agreement in ſuch matters; For both the Council of Trent, and our Engliſh Convocation, have taken eſpecial care by a latitude of expreſſion to obtain the aſſent of men, who vaſtly differ in their opinions*: Which is a falſe account of the Engliſh Convocation, but a very true, tho ſtrange account of that Infallible Council of Trent, of which more preſently. But is not this a clever way of ſlinging off all diſputes about Doctrines and Opinions? His buſineſs is to prove the Agreement of my Principles about Church-Communion, with the Church of Rome. For after all his talk of the Church of

of *England*, he has not one word about her, unless he takes me for the Church of *England*, which I assure him I never took my self to be; but it seems one poor single Divine may pass for the Church of *England*, since it is dwindled into a *name and shadow*, tho it would be Misrepresentation in a Protestant to impute the Opinions and Doctrines of Popes, Cardinals, Doctors, School-men, Canonists, Casuists, nay of General Councils themselves, if they happen to forget their *Anathema's*, to the Church of *Rome*: I say, his design being to show the Agreement of my Principles with the Church of *Rome*, he knew this was impossible to be done, unless he laid aside the Consideration of all Doctrines and Opinions. But are these of no account then in the Church of *Rome*? Is it no matter what our Opinions are, so we do but maintain the Popes Supremacy? I think the Supremacy an intolerable usurpation on the Rights and Liberties of the Christian Church; but I think the Popish Innovations in Faith and Worship more intolerable Corruptions of the Christian Religion, and more fatal to mens souls; and therefore tho men groan'd under the oppressions of the See of *Rome*, they were other Corruptions which gave birth to the Reformation, witness *Luthers* Reformation; and tho I should suppose it possible to be perswaded for peace sake to submit to the Usurpations of the Bishop of *Rome*, if all other Abuses and Corruptions were taken away, yet while the Corruptions of Faith and Worship remain, while I believe them to be such dangerous Corruptions, it makes Reconciliation impossible; for tho I may be contented to be oppressed in my Christian Liberties, I can never be contented to be damned; which is the difference between submitting to an usurped Authority, and complying with a corrupt Faith and Worship; for tho I hope a great many who do so will



find Mercy, yet those can expect none who are convinced of these Corruptions, and yet comply, which would be my case. So that he begins at the wrong end to prove my Agreement with the Church of *Rome*; for tho my Principles did prove, and tho I were my self perswaded that the Bishop of *Rome* had a regular and Canonical Authority over all other Churches, while he is a truly Catholick and Orthodox Bishop, yet I should think such Corruptions in Faith and Worship sufficient to absolve all Christians from their subjection to him; and therefore whatever my Principles of Church-Communion are, there is little hope of my Agreement with the Church of *Rome*, while these Doctrinal Corruptions last; and it is a vain thing to prove an Agreement in Principles of Government, unless they can prove an Agreement in Faith and Worship too. There was no dispute, that I know of, between the Catholicks and the *Arians* about Principles of Government; but he would have been laughed at, who should hence have inferred an Agreement between them.

However setting aside this, let us consider how he proves that Doctrines and Opinions are so little, or not at all, concerned in the Agreement of the two Churches, viz. because *both the Council of Trent, and the English Convocation, have taken especial care by a Latitude of expression to obtain the assent of men, who vastly differ in their Opinions.* Has the Church of *Rome* then, and the Church of *England*, no positive Opinions to which they expect the Assent of their Members, especially of their Clergy? He instances in the Doctrine of Predetermination, or which among us are better known by the name of *Arminian* Controversies; now suppose they thought fit to give a latitude of Sense in their defining these Controversies, have they positively defined nothing?

Has



Has not the Church of *Rome* in exprefs terms decreed the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, of worship of Saints, and images, of the Adoration of the Host, of Seven Sacraments, of Purgatory? &c. And has not the Church of *England* as positively determined against them? And where is the agreement then between the Two Churches? The truth is, there cannot be a worse thing said of any Church, than what this Author charges both upon the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, that they purposely penn'd their Decrees in such loose terms, that men of different Opinions might expound them to their own sense: Which is to make a show of deciding a Controvesy, with an intention all the while to leave it undecided; which is such a juggle as unbecomes the Sincerity of a Christian Church. There may be a great many nice Philosophical disputes, which a wise Church may think necessary to leave undecided; but there never can be any good reason, instead of determining Controversies, to lay the foundation of endless disputes between the Members of the same Communion, by doubtful and ambiguous expressions.

And therefore I absolutely deny, that the Church of *England* has done this, or ever intended to do it. She has indeed used that temper and moderation in those Articles, which relate to the Five points, as only to determine what is substantial in them, and necessary to be believed by all Christians, without deciding those Niceties, whereon the Controversie between the *Calvinist* and the *Arminian* turns, and therefore both of them may subscribe these Articles, because the Controversies between them are determined on neither side; and the appeasing such heats, as may be occasioned by those Disputes, is left to the prudence of Governours, which was thought a better way than a positive decision of them: This

I think

I think, I could make appear, were it a proper place for it; and therefore have always thought, that the Church of *England* was wronged on both sides; while both the *Calvinist* and *Arminian* have forced her to speak their own sense, when she intended to speak neither. And no man can blame this conduct, who remembers, that this is only a reviving that old Philosophical dispute about Necessity and Fate, which always has been a dispute, and is likely to continue so; and though these different Opinions have very different effects on our minds, and form very different apprehensions in us of Almighty God, which may be a just reason to prefer one before the other; yet they are both consistent with the belief of all the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, as I have shewed at large in that Book to which this Author so often refers.

Vindication of  
the Defence of  
Dr. Stilling-  
fleet. p. 281, &c.

But now the Church of *Rome* has truly used this art, which this Author charges her with, such a latitude of expression and ambiguous terms, as might satisfy their differing Divines, that the cause was determined on their side, when there was no other way to end their disputes, and allay their heats; and that in many concerning points too, as any one may see, who reads *Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent*; and if this be intolerable in a fallible Church, it is much more intolerable in a Council, which pretends to Infallibility. Certainly they distrusted their own Authority; either did not believe themselves to be Infallible, or knew, that their Divines did not think them so; for otherwise the Authority of the Council might have over-ruled their Disputes, and there had been no need of cheating them into an assent: But what expectation is there, that the decrees of those men should be Infallible, who so often intended to decree nothing? This is a Mystery, which  
I sup-

I suppose our Author would not so freely have confessed at another time ; but it was necessary to allow this latitude of sense in the Decrees of the *Trent* Council now, to bring off Mr. *De Meaux*, and the Representers, who do indeed expound the Decrees of the Council to a great latitude of sense : But it is not a little matter will help them out ; the latitude of one side of the Line will not do, but it must reach from Pole to Pole. There is another ingenious confession of this Author, which is worth the noting ; *That among the Romanists, about the great Doctrine of Predetermination, there are the Durandists, Dominicans, Jansenists, Molinists, and Scotists, that very much differ in Opinion, and yet are still of the same Church :* and yet these are the men, that quarrel at the reformation, because there are differing Opinions among them, when there are the same Disputes among themselves, managed with as great heat and contention. These are the men, who tell us, that we must have an infallible Judge to end our disputes, when an infallible Pope, and infallible Councils, dare not undertake to end theirs : but as for what he adds, that *there are in the Church of England, Calvinists, Arminians, Socinians, and Antinomians, who subscribe the same Articles of Religion, as terms of Unity and Peace :* As for Calvinists and Arminians, I will grant, they may both subscribe our Articles ; whether any Socinians do, I know not, no more than they know when a secret Jew, or one who does not believe Transubstantiation, is receiv'd into holy Orders by them ; but I am sure an honest Socinian cannot subscribe our Articles, unless he can subscribe the *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds ; but this was only designed to propagate that groundless calumny, That the Divines of the Church of *England* are infected with *Socinianism*.

Having

Having thus as well as he could, delivered himself from ingaging in that Dispute, about our agreement in doctrinal Points, which he knew he could make nothing of; he says, *He will confine himself to the agreement there is between both Churches about Government and Worship*; and threatens to show, how we have disputed against Dissenters upon Roman-Catholick Principles, both in proving their Obligation to Communion with us, and in vindicating the terms of our Communion from being sinful. This is what he undertakes to prove, and we are bound to hear him.

### Answer to SECT. I.

*Concerning the Church of Englands Closure with a Roman Catholick Principle about the Government of the Church, in proving the Dissenter to lie under an Obligation of holding Communion with her.*

AND now we are come to the main seat of the Controversy about Catholick communion, which our Author has very dexterously improved into Catholick Power and Empire. I need give him no hard words; to expose his manifest and wilful prevarications in this matter, will be thought hard enough, if he be capable of blushing. Now to make this as visible as the light; I shall, I. Shew, wherein he pretends the Agreement between the Two Churches consists; that is, between my principles of Communion, and the Church of Rome; for I am the only person here concerned; and if I cannot vindicate my self, I will own my own shame, without casting the blame on my dear Mother the Church of England; and I suppose, it will be sufficient to vindicate

cate my self, if I first show him, that I have in express words rejected all those Propositions wherein he pretends this Agreement consists. Secondly, Particularly vindicate those passages he transcribes out of my books, and shew his sincerity in quoting, and his skill in applying, and then his *French Popery* may shift for it self, excepting a word or two of that learned Arch-bishop *Petrus de Marca*.

As for the first, He himself has collected the Particulars wherein we agree, which I shall distinctly examine; the Reader may find them *p. 15, 16.* which are these,

1. *They both make the Catholick Church, one visible governed Society, Household or Kingdom.* This is the *ἡ πρώτη πρῶτος*, the first and fundamental mistake, and a wilful one too; for I affirm the contrary in express words, in the defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet's* unreasonableness of Separation, *p. 565, 566,* upon occasion of that Dispute about the constitutive Regent Head of a National Church; I expressly assert, That the Unity, both of the National and Universal Church, consists in one Communion; That Consent is all that is necessary to unite a Body or Society in one Communion;— That their Unity consists only in consent, not in any superior Governing-Ecclesiastical Power on Earth, which binds them together: So that I absolutely deny, That the Catholick Church is one governed Society, with one supreme Government over the whole. *P. 567.* I assert, That *Christ hath instituted no such constitutive Regent Power of one Bishop over another in his Church; and therefore, the Union of particular Churches into one, must be made by consent, not by Superiority of Power.* *P. 564.* I affirm, That *tho a National Church (and the Reason is stronger for the Universal Church) be one Body, yet it is not such a political Body as they describe, and cannot be according to its original*



*Constitution, which differs from Secular forms of Government (which have a supreme governing Power) by that Ancient Church-Canon of our Saviours own decreeing, It shall not be so among you. And thus, a National Church as governed by consent, may be one Body in an Ecclesiastical, tho not in a Civil Political Sense; that is, by one Communion, not by one Supreme governing Power: The Dean in Answer to Mr. Baxter, who asserts a constitutive Regent Head of the National Church, necessary to make it a Church, and yet allows, That there is one Catholick Visible Church, and that all particular Churches, as headed by their particular Bishops or Pastors, are parts of the Universal Church; argues thus, If this Doctrine be true, and withal it be necessary, that every Church must have a constitutive Regent Part as essential to it; then it unavoidably follows, That there must be a Catholick Visible Head to the Catholick Visible Church; and so Mr. B's Constitutive Regent Part of the Church, hath done the Pope a wonderful kindness, and made a very plausible Plea for his Universal Pastorship. Where the Dean proves, That a Constitutive Regent Head is not essential to the Notion of a National Church, for then it must be essential to the Catholick Church too; and then there must be a supreme Pastor, or some supreme governing Power over the whole Church, which I suppose, is to deny that the Catholick Church is one visible governed Society. This Argument I defended at large, and added (p. 576.) That to deny a Church can be one without a constitutive Regent Head, infers one of these two things. 1. Either that many particular Churches cannot associate into one, for the joynt Exercise of Discipline and Government, which overthrows the very Notion of Catholick Unity and Communion. Or 2. That there is and must be a power in the Church, superior to the Episcopal Power, which naturally sets up a Pope above Bishops. Thus*

much

Defence, p.  
572.



much for my agreement with them, that *the Catholick Church is one visible governed Society*, that is, which has a supreme Power over the whole; and if our Author by this time does not begin to Colour, I will e'en Blush for him. But by this the Reader will perceive, what a hopeful Cause this Author has undertaken, to prove my Agreement with the Church of *Rome* about the Supremacy, either of the Pope or General Council, when I absolutely deny, that there is, or ought to be any such Superior Authority and Jurisdiction over the whole Church. But to proceed.

2. He says, *They both pitch upon the Episcopal Government as distributed into the several Subordinations of combined Churches, as what is by Divine Institution made the Government of the Church: A combination of Diocesan Churches to make up one Provincial, whose Bishops are in Subordination to their Metropolitan; a combination of Provincial Churches to make up a National, and the Metropolitans in Subordination to the Primate; a combination of National Churches to make up a Patriarchal, and the Primates in Subordination to the Patriarch; and a confederacy of Patriarchal to make up one Oecumenical, and every Patriarch in Subordination to the Oecumenical Bishop, or chief Patriarch.* This is an Agreement with a Witness; and if he can prove this, as he says he has done, of which more presently, we will never dispute more with them about Church-Government; let us then consider the several steps and Gradations of Church-Authority, which at last centers in an Universal Bishop.

1. The Subordination of Parochial Presbyters, who are combined and united under the Government of a Diocesan Bishop. Thus far we agree with him, and acknowledge a direct Superiority of Bishops over their respective Presbyters; but we go not one step farther with him.

2. *A combination of Diocesan Churches to make up one Provincial, whose Bishops are in Subordination to their*

## A Vindication of

*Metropolitan.* Such a Combination I allow of, but the *Subordination* I deny to be the original Form of Church Associations; and this one word *Subordination*, which he has here thrust in, discovers the whole Trick, and spoils our Agreement quite. I assert, these Combinations are for Communion, not for Government, and therefore there is no *Subordination* required to such an Union; he will have these Combinations to be, not merely for Communion, but for Government, and that indeed requires a Subordination; but these two Notions do as vastly differ, as a friendly Association for mutual Advice and Counsel, and a Subjection to a Superior Authority. And that I have not altered my Opinion, but that this was always my judgment in the case, I shall now show, and I need to that purpose only transcribe a Page or Two out of the Defence, p. 577, &c. "It is evident from the Testimony of the earliest Ages of the Church, that first the Apostles, and then the Bishops as their Successors, were the Supreme Governours of the Church, who had no higher Order or Power over them : And therefore *Tertullian* calls the Bishop, *Summus Sacerdos*, or the chief and highest Priest; and *Optatus Apices & Principes*, the Tops and Princes of all; which was the general Language of those days; as any one who pleases, may learn from Dr. *Barrow's* learned Treatise of the Popes Supremacy.

Tert. de Bapt.  
c. 17.  
*Barrow.* Supremacy, p.  
189, &c.  
*Quarto.*

"And as Bishops were the highest Governours of the Church, so every Bishop was greatest in his own Diocess; no other Bishop, nor Synod of Bishops, could impose any thing on him, without his own Consent; they met for Advice and Counsel, not for Rule and Empire; which, Mr. *B.* tells us so often, was Arch-bishop *Usher's* Judgment, and which plainly was the Judgment and Practice of Antiquity, as appears from what I have already discoursed about Catholick Communi-

"on -

“ on : It were easie to transcribe several Passages out of  
 “ St. Cyprian to this purpose, especially from his Preface  
 “ to the Council of Carthage, where he tells them, *That*  
 “ *they were met freely to declare their Opinions about this*  
 “ *matter ( “ the Rebaptization of those who had been*  
 “ *Baptized by Hereticks ) judging us *non*, nor denying*  
 “ *Communion to him if he dissent : For neither doth any of*  
 “ *us constitute himself Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical*  
 “ *terror compel his Colleagues to a necessity of obeying ; since*  
 “ *every Bishop being free and in his own power, has his own free*  
 “ *choice, and can neither be judged by another, nor judg another ;*  
 “ *but let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ,*  
 “ *who alone has power both to advance us to the Government of*  
 “ *his Church, and judg of our Government ; and in p. 579. I add,*

“ Nor does this overthrow that very Ancient Consti-  
 “ tution of Patriarchal or Metropolitan Churches ; for  
 “ a Patriarch or Metropolitan was not a Superior Order  
 “ to Bishops, nor included any Authority over them, as is  
 “ evident from what St. Cyprian discoursed, who was him-  
 “ self a Primate, but only some precedency in the same  
 “ Order, and such advantages of Power in the Go-  
 “ vernment of the Church, as was given them by the  
 “ common consent of Bishops for a greater publick  
 “ good ; as the power of calling Provincial Synods,  
 “ and presiding in them, and a principal Interest in the Or-  
 “ dination of Bishops in his Province, and the like, which  
 “ were determined and limited by Ecclesiastical Canons.

“ It is true this Patriarchal Power did in time degene-  
 “ rate into Domination and Empire, when it fell into the  
 “ hands of ambitious men ; but was originally ( and is  
 “ so still, when wise and good men have the manage-  
 “ ment of it ) a very prudent constitution to preserve  
 “ Peace and Order, and good Discipline in the Church.

“ But that Arch-bishops and Metropolitans had no  
 “ proper Superiority and Jurisdiction over Bishops, is evi-  
 “ dent

Hieron. ad  
Marcel. Ep. 54.

“dent from what St. *Hierom* objects against the Discipline of the *Montenists*, Amongst us (i. e. the Catholics) the Bishops enjoy the place of the Apostles; among them the Bishop is but the third; for they have the Patriarch of Pepusa in Phrygia for the first, those whom they call Cenones for the second; thus Bishops are thrust down into the third, that is, almost the last place. “And yet in “St. *Hieroms* time the Catholick Church had Arch-  
“bishops and Metropolitans, but yet it seems not such  
“as degraded Bishops, or advanced any above them. Whether this be true Reasoning or no, shall be examined when there is occasion for it; all that I am concerned in at present, is only to show, that I never asserted such an Original Combination of Metropolitan Churches, as placed Bishops in subordination to the Metropolitan, or gave him a direct Authority or Jurisdiction over them; and here our Agreement must for ever break off; for if it will not reach to the Jurisdiction of Metropolitans and Primates, much less will it extend to Patriarchs, and least of all to an Oecumenical Pastor, whom I have in express terms rejected, and for what reason will appear anon.

3. The next instance of Agreement is, That we both agree in giving to a General Council direct Authority over their Collegues in matters that concern the Purity of Faith and Manners, and the Unity of the Church. But here are two considerable Mistakes in this Matter: 1. That I give this Authority to a General Council. 2. That I give a General Council, or any other Combination of Bishops a direct Authority over their Collegues.

1. That I give this Authority to General Councils. My Dissenting Adversaries began this Charge, that I set up a General Council, as a Superior Governing Power over the whole Church, and consequently over all Bishops, and therefore was no better than a *Cassandrian* or a *French* Papist; and our Author revives this charge with-  
out

out taking any notice, that it was ever Objected and Answered before : indeed he has Objected nothing in this whole matter, but what was before Objected by Dissenters with as much Art and appearance of Truth, as he has now given it : And I could more easily forgive it in them, because it might be an innocent mistake in them, till these notions were thoroughly sifted, and set in a better light ; but for our Author to read that very Book, *The Vindication of the Defence of Dr. Stillingfleet*, wherein all these Objections were made and Answered, and to renew the Charge, and repeat the Objections again, without taking notice of any Answer that was given to them, is such a piece of Ingenuity, as an honest Dissenter would be ashamed of. In my Defence of the *Dean*, there was not one word which looked towards a General Council, excepting the *Collegium Episcopale*, or the Episcopal Colledg, which some mistook for a General Council ; but this mistake I rectified in the *Vindication*, p. 146. I observed, that Optatus called the whole body of Bishops Collegium Episcopale, and upon the same account St. Cyprian and St. Austin call all Catholick Bishops Collegues ; and they may as well say, That when the Fathers speak of the Unity of the Episcopacy, they mean their Union in a General Council, as that they mean a General Council by the Colledg of Bishops. In St. Cyprians time there never had been a General Council, excepting the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem ; and yet when he wrote to forreign Bishops, with whom he never was joined in Council, nor ever like to be, he calls them his Collegues, or those of the same Colledg with him ; which signifies no more than that they were of the same Power and Authority with him, and united in one Communion. And what my thoughts are of a General Council, whoever pleases, may see some Pages after : p. 162, 163, &c.

2. Nor do I give a direct Authority to any Bishops or



Vindicat. p. 15.

217.

or Council of Bishops over their Collegues : This I expressly deny in Forty places, as to be sure every man must do, who acknowledgcs, that all Bishops have originally an equal power, and the Supreme Authority in their respective Diocesses. *That no Bishops either single or united have any direct Authority or Superiority over each other. That the combinations of Churches, and the Synods and Councils of Bishops, are not for direct acts of Government, and Superiority over each other ; with several other like expressions before quoted.*

But do I not say, *That General Councils can have no direct Authority over any Bishops, who refuse to consent, unless it be in such matters as concern the purity of Faith, and manners, and Catholick Unity?* and does not this infer, that they have a direct Authority over them in such matters?

This possibly might lie a little out of our Author's reach, I not having occasion then given me to discourse it more at large ; but if he had not understood this, it had been more modest and ingenuous to have thought it an unwary saying, or to have made a Query upon it, and desired me to have reconciled this seeming contradiction, rather than to charge me with such Principles, as I so often expressly and positively reject. But ingenuity and modesty are Virtues not to be expected from such Adversaries, and therefore I shall briefly state this matter also, by 1. Showing what I meant, by *matters which concern the purity of Faith and Manners, and Catholick Unity.* 2. What Authority I give to bishops, or a Council of Bishops over their Collegues in such cases, and how this is to be reconciled with my affirming, that the combinations of Churches, and the Synods and Councils of Bishops, are not for direct acts of Government and Superiority over each other, but only for mutual advice and counsel.

1. As for the first, when I say, *That Neighbour Bishops*

Bishops, or a Council of Bishops, has Authority over their Collegues in matters which concern the purity of Faith and Manners, and Catholick Unity, it is plain that my meaning was not, and could not be, That such a Council of Bishops had Authority to make what Decrees they pleased in matters of Faith or Manners, or Catholick Unity, and impose them upon their Collegues by a direct and superior Authority, without their own consent; for this is the very thing I disputed against; and yet this is the sense he would put upon my words, and indeed no other sense of them can do the Church of Rome any service; but let any indifferent Reader consider the whole Paragraph, and freely judg whether this Author be not a very Candid Interpreter. I was discoursing about General Councils, "That it is not likely there should ever be a Convention of Bishops from all parts of the Christian World; nor if it were possible, that there should be some few Bishops dispatched from all Christian Churches, all the world over, can I see any reason why this should be called a General Council, when it may be there are Ten times as many Bishops who did not come to the Council, as those who did; and why should the less number of Bishops assembled in Council, judg for all the rest, who so far exceed them in numbers, and it may be are not inferior to them in Piety and Wisdom; especially considering, that every Bishop has the Supreme Government of his own Church, and his liberty and power to choose for himself, as St. Cyprian tells us; and must not be compelled to obedience by any of his Collegues; which overthrows the proper Jurisdiction of General Councils, which can have no direct Authority over any Bishops, who refuse to consent, unless it be in such matters, as concern the Purity of Faith and Manners, and Catholick Unity. Now if Faith and Manners, and Catholick Unity, were considered as the Subject of Conciliary Decrees, what greater Authority could the Council of Trent it self desire than this, to have Authority to make Decrees about Faith and Manners, and Catholick Unity, which shall oblige all the Bishops

Vindic. p. 162.

Ibid. p. 157.

in the World: For I know not any thing else for a Council of Christian Bishops to make Decrees about: And therefore these matters which concern Faith and Manners, only relate to the Faith and Manners of the Bishop: as I elsewhere expressly teach, *That a Bishop cannot be imposed on against his own consent, by any Bishop or Council of Bishops, nor can justly be deposed upon such accounts, while he neither corrupts the Faith, nor schismatically divides the Church.* So that this Authority refers not to the Decrees of Councils about Faith or Manners, but is only an Authority of censuring Heretical and Schismatical Bishops.

2. But that we may better understand the true state of this matter, let us consider what kind of Authority this is: And

201.9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17.

1. I observe this is no act of Authority over Bishops considered as Bishops, but over Hereticks and Schismatics; and no man that I know of, ever denied the Churches Power to censure Heresie or Schism, or to correct the Lives and Manners of Men; and if Hereticks and Schismatics, wicked and profligate Persons, may be flung out of the Church; if any Bishops be such, there is no reason their Character should excuse them, for that does not lessen but aggravate their Crime.

2. And therefore this is no usurpation upon the Episcopal Power and Government; it is not imposing Laws or Rules on a Bishop for the Government of his Church without his consent, which is an Usurpation upon the Episcopal Authority; but it is only judging him unworthy to be a Bishop, and committing the care of his Flock to some more fit person.

3. This Authority does not result from that superior Jurisdiction, which one Bishop, or all the Bishops in the World have over any one single Bishop, but from that obligation which every Bishop has as far as he can, to take care of the whole flock of Christ, as I explain it in the *Vindication*, p. 156. That the *Unity of the Episcopacy is the foundation of that Authority which neighbour Bishops have over their Collegues in case of Heresie or Schism, or any notorious wickedness; for they being Bishops of the Universal Church, have an original Right and Power (not to govern their Collegues, but) to take care*

that

that no part of the Church which is within their reach and inspection suffer by the heresie or evil practices of their Collegues, which as I observed in the Defence, p. 215. is the reason St. Cyprian gives why there are so many Bishops in the Christian Church whom he calls a copious body of Bishops coupled by the cement of concord, and bond of Unity. That if any of our colleges (i.e. any Bishop) should endeavour to breach any new Heresie, or tear and spoil the Flock of Christ, the rest may come in to their help, and like good and merciful Pastors, gather again the Sheep of Christ into the fold. So that this is not properly an Authority over Bishops, who have originally no superior Jurisdiction over each other, but an obligation on all Bishops, as far as they can, to see that no part of the Christian Church be corrupted with Heresie, or divided by Schisms; the discharge of which may impower them to remove Heretical Bishops, without any direct Authority to govern Bishops. So that this power of deposing Heretical and Wicked Bishops does not contradict what I before asserted, That by original right, all Bishops are equal; and every Bishop supreme in his own Diocess, who cannot be compelled by other Bishops to govern his Church by such Rules and Laws as he himself does not assent to; and therefore that such Combinations and Councils of Bishops are not originally for direct acts of Government and superiorty over each other, but only for mutual Counsel and Advice: For these are two very different things, To have Authority to compel a Bishop to govern his Church by such Laws as he himself in his own conscience does not approve; and to have Authority to sling a notorious Heretical or Schismatical Bishop out of their Communion, and to command and exhort his Presbyters and People not to own him, St. Cyprian I am sure thought these two cases very different; for the first he utterly rejects as an usurpation on the Episcopal Authority, that it was to make themselves Bishops of Bishops, which he thought a great impiety; the other he practised himself in the case of *Basilides* and *Martialis*. For the first is a direct Authority over Bishops in the exercise of



their Episcopal Function; the second is only an Authority to censure Heresie and Schism, and to preserve the Communion of the Church pure, and to defend the Flock from such Wolves in Sheeps Clothing.

But it may be it will be Objected, That this comes much to one; for the Authority of deposing Heretical and Schismatical Bishops, infers an Authority of declaring Heresie and Schism; and that of making or declaring Articles of Faith, and Laws of Catholick Communion; for how can they depose Hereticks or Schismatics without an Authority of declaring what Heresie and Schism is? And this is as much Authority as the Council of *Trent* it self would have desired; and therefore it seems very absurd and contradictory to deny a Council Authority to oblige their Collegues by their Decrees of Faith, or Manners, or Catholick Unity, and to give Authority to neighbour Bishops to depose or censure any Heretical or Schismatical Bishop. To this purpose our Author argues, p. 32. 33. *According to their Doctrine the Bishops of Spain, France, Italy, and Germany, being Bishops of the Catholick Church, tho' ordinarily their Power is confined to their particular Churches, yet having an Original right with relation to the whole Catholick Church, are bound by the Laws of Communion to re-assume their Original right, and assemble and summon before them the Bishops of the Church of England; who, in their opinion, are fallen into a great Schism and Heresy; in which matters these Bishops have a direct Authority over the Bishops of the Church of England, and may proceed against them, and depose them, and ordain others in their room, and oblige the People to withdraw from the communion of the deposed Bishops, in which case the foreign Bishops being the governing part, have as much authority over the English Bishops, as the English Bishops have over the Dissenters in England. He should have said as the English Bishops have over the Popish bishops of France, Spain, or Italy, and then he had come pretty near the matter. He adds*  
*"The larger combination of Bishops, the greater is their Power and Authority. And therefore if the English Bishops*  
*" have*



“ have a direct Authority over the Dissenters in *England*, so  
 “ has this greater combination of Bishops over the dissenting  
 “ *English* Bishops; ( that is, if Bishops have Authority over  
 their own Flocks, then the Bishops of *France* and *Spain*  
 have Authority over *English* Bishops; if Bishops must govern  
 their own Churches, other Bishops may govern them; an  
 inference which I believe, our Author is the first man,  
 that ever made.) “ And as the *English* Bishops insist on their  
 “ Authority in decision of Controversies, and the Dissenter  
 “ must submit; so may this greater College of Bishops urge  
 “ their Authority, and the Dissenting *English* Bishops must  
 “ submit, and may not be admitted to exercise their own  
 “ judgment, or pretend Conscience there, no more than the  
 “ *English* Protestant Dissenter may do it here.

“ It must be carefully observed, that by these Gentlemen  
 “ the Power is lodged with the College of Catholic Bishops;  
 “ and so long as the Church of *England* acknowledges the Bi-  
 “ shops of these Countries to be Catholick Bishops, as now  
 “ they do (just as we acknowledg the Church of *Rome* to be  
 part of the Catholick Church, but a very corrupt and schis-  
 matical part of it) “ they cannot question their power, that  
 “ they must acknowledg: And by the Laws of Catholick  
 “ Communion must obey a College of them, and appear be-  
 “ fore them, when Summoned: The greatest thing, that  
 “ they can with any pretence insist on, is the justness of  
 “ their cause, of which they are no more competent judges  
 “ before this College, than the Dissenters are, when before  
 “ these Bishops here. What happy days would the Church  
 of *Rome* see, were things brought to this pass! but how im-  
 pertinent all his talk of the College of Bishops is, has been al-  
 ready shown, and will be more in what follows: All that I  
 observe at present is, how he turns the power of deposing,  
 and censuring heretical and schismatical Bishops into a power  
 of declaring Heresy, and judging whether they be Hereticks  
 or not, by such a final and uncontrollable power, as Here-  
 ticks themselves are bound to submit to: And which is more

ridiculous than that, if one Church agrees to accuse another Church of Heresy, the accusers alone must be judges, and the accused are very incompetent Judges of it, because forsooth they are accused: But this matter may be stated without setting up such a Sovereign Tribunal for judging of Heresies. For  
1. That Heretical Bishops may be deposed, I think all agree in.  
2. And there is as little question, but that Orthodox and Catholick Bishops, who have the care of the Church committed to them, have this power of deposing: That is, of casting such a Bishop out of their Communion, and exhorting his People to withdraw Communion from him, and to accept of a Catholick Bishop in his stead; which is all that the Ecclesiastical power of deposing signifies.

3. There is no question neither, but that all Bishops will call that Heresy, which they themselves think to be so, and will judge those to be Hereticks, who profess such Doctrines, as they call Heresy.

4. But it does not hence follow, that any Bishop, or any number of Bishops, however assembled, have such an Authority to define Articles of Faith, or to declare Heresy, as shall oblige all men to believe that to be Heresy, which they decree to be so.

5. And therefore the effects of these Censures must of necessity depend upon that Opinion, which People have of them: Those who believe the Censure just, will withdraw themselves from the Communion of such a Bishop, those who do not believe it just, will still communicate with him. For who ever pronounces the Sentence, (excepting the interposing of Secular power) the People must execute it, and if they will still adhere to their Bishop, he may deny his Deposers, and all their power. As the *English* Bishops and People do all the *Anathemas* of the Church of *Rome*.

6. And whether they do right or wrong in this, their own Consciences must judge in this world, and God will judge in the next: This is all that can be said or done in such a broken and divided State of the Church, as we now see. While nothing was called Heresie but the denial of

some

some plain and acknowledged Article of the Christian Faith, while there was no dispute, who were Hereticks, the power of deposing Hereticks was sacred and venerable, and had its just authority and effect; but since what is Heresie is the Controversie, and the world is divided about it, tho the power remains still, the exercise of it grows very contemptible, when a Church first coyns new Articles of Faith, and then Excommunicates, Censures, Deposes those for Hereticks, who will not believe them.

4ly. We are come now to the last Point, wherein he says we agree, viz. *To give to one Bishop a Primacy, for the better preserving Catholick Union, and also a Superior power of Appeals, and exercising some peculiar acts of Discipline under the regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons.* Now all this indeed I do assert, and yet we are very far from agreeing in this matter. For though they made no more of the Pope than a meer Primate, which I doubt is not good doctrine in Rome, yet there is as much difference between our Primates, as there is between a National and Oecumenical Primate, and consequently as much difference between our Appeals, as between Appeals to Rome, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as between Appeals to the Primate of a National Church, and Appeals to foreign Bishops. I know he disputes very learnedly, that such an Oecumenical combination of Churches, and an Oecumenical Primate is more for the preservation of Cathol. Unity, than a National Church or Primate; but this he knew I denied, and therefore should not have said, that I agree with them in it, and who has the best reason on their side shall be examined presently.

By this time I suppose the Reader is satisfied how far we agree in these things, I having in express words denied every thing which he has affirmed in these very Books, to which he has appealed; which I think is no great sign of agreement.

2. It is time now to vindicate those passages which he quotes out of my Book, and on which he founds this pretence of agreement between us; and to do this effectually and plainly,

plainly, I must as I go along briefly explain some of my Principles, which our Author either did not understand, or did wilfully misrepresent.

All the sayings he has picked up, and brought together from one end of the Book to t'other, relate to one of these two Principles, The Unity of the Church, which is one Communion, or the Unity of the Episcopacy.

1. As for the first of these, *The Unity of the Church*, the whole mystery of it is no more but this, That the whole Christian Church, by the Institution of our Saviour, is but one Church, and this one Church is one Communion, that is, one Body and Society, whereof all Christians are members, and wherein they have a right to communicate in all Christian Priviledges, and have both a right and obligation to Communicate in all Christian Duties: This our Author puts in the second place, tho it ought to be the first, as being the Foundation of all: *That all Christians and Christian Churches in the world are one Body, Society, or Church, and this is called Catholick Communion*; for they being all one Body, they Communicate with each other in this one Body, in all the Duties and Priviledges of it; and what advantage he can make make of this, I cannot yet guess, unless he thinks that the very name *Catholick* being one of *Bellarmin's* Notes of the Church, *Catholick Communion*, must signifie the Communion of the Catholick Church of Rome.

My Adversaries hearing this word *Communion*, presently concluded, that I placed the Unity of the Church in some meer transient acts of Communion, and disputed very earnestly against it, as well they might. But this mistake I rectified in my *Vindication*, and showed them that *one Communion signifies one Body and Society, in which all the Members communicate with each other*; which I explain'd by this familiar comparison: Suppose the whole World were one Family, or one Kingdom, in which every particular man, according to his rank and station, enjoys equal priviledges; in this case the necessity of Affairs would require, that men should live in distinct houses and

Agreement,  
Pag. 7.

Vind. P. 36.



and distinct Countries, as now they do all the World over: But yet if every man enjoyed the same Liberty and Priviledges, wherever he went; as he does now in his own House and Country, the whole World would be but one House and Family, or Universal Kingdom; and whosoever should resolve to live by himself, and not receive any others into his Family, nor allow them the liberty of his House, would be guilty of making a Schism in this great Family of the World: And what Nations soever should deny the Rights and Priviledges of natural Subjects to the Inhabitants of other Countries, would make a Schism, and rent it self from this Universal Kingdom. I added,

Thus it is here; *The Church of Christ is but one Body, one Church, one Household and Family, one Kingdom.* These words our Author sets in the Front, and thinks to make something of them: for seeing all know, that to make the whole World one Universal Kingdom, it's necessary that it be subjected under one governing Head; it unavoidably follows, that unless in the Catholick Church there be one Supreme Governing Head, it cannot be like to an Universal Kingdom, an organized politick Body. Very right! Had I compared the Catholick Church to an Universal Kingdom, with respect to Government, the consequence had been good; but comparing it only with respect to Communion, the consequence is ridiculous; and yet this was all I intended in the Comparifon, as appears from the Application of it. And therefore though the necessity of Affairs requires, that Neighbour Christians combine themselves into particular Churches & particular Congregations, as the world is divided into particular Families and Kingdoms, (which shows, that I no more subject the Church to one Governing-head, than I do the World to one Universal Monarch, now it is divided into particular Kingdoms) yet every Christian, by virtue of his Christianity hath the same Right and Priviledg, and the same Obligation to Communion, as occasion serves, with all the Churches in the World, that he has with that particular Church, wherein he lives; wherever he removes his dwelling, whatever Church he goes to, he is still in the same Family, the same Kingdom, and



*the same Church.* Now whether this be a good Consequence, that because I make the whole Christian Church one Family and Kingdom, with respect to Christian Communion; that is that all true Christians have a right to Communion in all true Christian Churches in the World, therefore I subject the whole Christian Church to one Supreme Governing Head on Earth (for with respect to Christ, who is the true and only Head of his Church, we will allow it to be one Kingdom and Family in this sense) I say, let any man judge of this, who understands Consequences. If our Author did not see this, the Reader may judge of his understanding; if he did, he may judge of his honesty. And thus his foundation is gone, and then all the superstructure is but a Castle in the Air: For if the Universal Church be not *one Organized politick body*, as according to my Principles it is not, then it cannot be subjected to one governing Head, neither to the Pope nor a General Council.

His third charge is, that I make *somewhat more necessary to Catholick Communion than an Agreement in the same Faith, the same Rules of Worship, and right Administration of the Sacraments*; that is, Catholick Communion is our union in one body, and communicating in this one body is the exercise of Catholick Communion, which those who do not, if there be not a just and necessary cause for it, are Schismatics for all that, whatever their Faith and Worship be; and Schism is a damning sin. But how does this make any thing more necessary to Catholick Communion, than the same Faith, the same Worship, the same Sacraments? These are all the Catholick terms of Catholick Communion; but if these do not unite us into one body, we are not united for all that: Not that any thing else is wanting to make this union; but because through the lusts, and vices, and passions of men, an union does not follow upon it: but he was sensible, that Catholick Communion alone, would not do his business, would not prove the necessity of one Supreme governing-head (whether the Pope, or a General Council) over the whole Church; and therefore he in-

insinuates, that I make something else the necessary terms of Catholick Communion, besides the true Christian Faith, Worship, and Sacraments; and what should that be, do you think, but subjection to one Supreme Head, which you shall see, how learnedly he proves; For he adds,

4. *That what is further necessary to Catholick Communion, is a Catholick Government, namely the Episcopal.* Now all these words I have used upon one occasion or other, but there is no such proposition as this in all my Book. I do allow Episcopacy to be an Apostolical Institution, and the truly Ancient and Catholick Government of the Church, of which more hereafter; but yet in this very book, I prove industriously, and at large, that in case of necessity, when Bishops cannot be had, a Church may be a truly Catholick Church, and such as we may, and ought to communicate with, without Bishops, in vindication of some foreign reformed Churches, who have none; and therefore I do not make Episcopacy so absolutely necessary to Catholick Communion, as to unchurch all Churches which have it not.

See Vindication of the Defence. p. 329, &c.

But the Remainder of his quotations referring to the *Unity of the Episcopacy*, I must briefly explain what my Notion is about it; and truly I have proceeded all along upon *St. Cyprian's Principles*, and he must answer for it, if he have misled me. *St. Cyprian* taught me, that there is one *Episcopacy*, part of which every Bishop holds with full authority and power; where by one Episcopacy *St. Cyprian* understands one Bishoprick, that is, the Universal Church, which as it is but one Church, is but one Bishoprick also; it being all under the Government of the Episcopal power. But then this Bishoprick is divided into parts, into particular Diocesses, and every Bishop has a part of this Universal Bishoprick, which he has in *solidum*; that is, he has his part to govern with the fulness and plenitude of the Episcopal power, without any Superior authority, or jurisdiction over him. This I take to be the plainest and easiest interpretation of *St. Cyprian's* words; for though all learned men have agreed in the same sense,

Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur *Cypr. de unitate. See the Defence. p. 208. &c.*

yet the Phrase has a little puzzled them; for if by one Episcopacy, we understand one Episcopal office and power, tho' the sense will be the same; yet the expression is very obscure; for how can every Bishop have but part of the Episcopal office in *Solidum*; that is, part of the office, and the whole power? But if by one Episcopacy, we understand one Bishoprick; and the universal Church may as properly be called one Bishoprick, as one Church, and one Sheepfold; then it is all plain, that there is but one Bishoprick, of which every Bishop has part, in which he exercises the whole Episcopal authority and power. Another Principle of St. Cyprian's is,

Unus Episcopatus, Episcoporum multorum concordia numerositate diffusus, Cyp. ad Antonian. Ep. 52. Pam.

Quando Ecclesia, quae Catholica una est, scissa non fit, neque divisa, sed sit utique connexa, & coherentium sibi invicem Sacerdotum glutino copulata. Cyp. Ep. 69. ad Florentium Pupianum.

that this one Episcopacy, or one Bishoprick, is preserved one by the concord and agreement of Bishops; for if the Bishops disagree, who have the Supreme government of their own Churches, this must of necessity divide the Bishoprick and the Church; but this one Bishoprick is spread over the World, by the consenting multitude of many Bishops; which, as I observed, he calls the *Unity and Peace of the Episcopacy*. And for the same reason Optatus calls it the *Episcopal College*; and Bishops are called *Collegues*. And St. Cyprian tells us, *The Catholick Church is not rent, nor divided, but united and completed by the cement of Bishops, who stick close together.*

Another Principle is, That no Bishop, nor Colledg of Bishops have a direct authority or jurisdiction over their Collegues, to compel them to submit to their decrees and definitions, against their own Judgment and Conscience: That none of them pretended to be Bishops of Bishops, which he abhors as a Tyrannical Usurpation, as we see in his Preface to the Council of *Carthage*. Another Principle is, That since there is but one Episcopacy or Bishoprick, every Bishop, besides the Supreme Government of his own particular Diocess, has such a relation to the whole Church, that he is to take care, as much as in him lies, to see, that no part of the Church suffer by the Heresies or Schisms of their Bishops; which is the reason, as I observed before, St. Cyprian gives, Why there are so many Bishops in the Christian Church,

Church, *That if any of our Colledge (i. e. any Bishop) should endeavour to broach any new Hereſie, or to tear and ſpoil the Flock of Chriſt, the reſt may come in to their help, and like good and merciful Paſtors, gather again the Sheep of Chriſt into their Fold.*

Cypr. ad Ste  
phan. Ep. 67.

These are the Principles I learnt from St. Cyprian ; and if our Author can find a ſupreme Head of the Univerſal Church, whether Pope or General Council, in this Scheme, I am ſure St. Cyprian could not, who diſowns any ſuch ſuperior Authority to Biſhops.

Let us then now return to our Author, who obſerves, that I aſſert, *That all the Biſhops of the Church are but one alſo,* ( which a little differs from one Biſhops being all ) *inveſted with the ſame Power and Authority to govern the Church ;* ( for which I quoted St. Cyprian, tho he thinks fit to leave him out ) ; *That as St. Cyprian tells us there is but one Epiſcopacy, part of which every Biſhop holds with full Authority and Power ; that all theſe Biſhops are but one body, who are bound to live in Communion with each other, and to govern their reſpective Churches where need requires, and where it can be had, by mutual Advice and Conſent, and therefore that no Biſhops are abſolutely Independent, but are obliged to preſerve the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, or Epiſcopal College, as Optatus calls it,* ( which words our Author leaves out, as being afraid of naming the Authority of any Father in the caſe ) *whereon the Unity and Communion of the Catholick Church depends.* Thus far our Author recites my words, and here breaks off; but I ſhall beg leave to go on. *For it is impoſſible the Catholick Church ſhould be one Body or Society, or one Communion, if it be divided into as many Independent Churches, as there are abſolute and independent Biſhops : For thoſe Churches muſt be independent which have an independent Power and Government, as all thoſe muſt have, which have independent Governors and Biſhops ; and independent Churches can never make one Body and one Catholick Communion ; becauſe they are not Members of each other ; and thus the Unity of the Catholick Church muſt be deſtroyed*

Vindic. p. 124.  
8cc.

*stroyed, unless we assert One Episcopacy as well as One Church, One Evangelical Priesthood as well as One Altar, all the world over.*

Here I must stop a little, for here he seems to lay his Foundation, whereon to erect his Papal Monarchy, or his Sovereign Power of General Councils; that I assert, That Bishops are not absolutely independent; and therefore he supposes, That they must be subordinate too to some higher Power and Jurisdiction. How far I am from asserting any such Supreme Power over the whole Church, I have already shown; and now I must vindicate this Principle, *That Bishops are not absolutely Independent*, from any such consequence, which is no very difficult task, if men will consider what I mean by the independency of Bishops, and for what reason I asserted, That Bishops are not absolutely independent. For the independency I deny, is such an independency as is opposed to the unity of the Episcopacy, and to their obligation to live in Communion with each other; for because there is but one Episcopacy, because all Bishops are but one body, therefore I assert, they are not absolutely independent, but are obliged to preserve the unity of the Episcopacy, or Episcopal College: for *absolute Independency* excludes all necessary obligations to Unity and Communion, as well as to Subjection. An absolute independent Sovereign Prince is no more bound by the Laws of Sovereignty to live in Unity, than to own subjection to neighbour Princes; now Bishops indeed as to subjection are independent, for there is no superior Authority in the Church over them, as I have always asserted; but they are not independent as to Unity and Communion; for the fundamental Laws of one Episcopacy oblige them to Unity and Communion, and that obliges them to govern their Churches by mutual advice, without which this Unity cannot be preserved. I am sure

Episcopi nec  
potestatem  
habere potest  
nec honorem,

*St. Cyprian* lays so much stress on this, that he expressly asserts, That *He cannot have the Power nor the Honour of a* *qui Episcopatus nec unitatem tenere voluit, nec pacem, Cyp. ad Anton. Ep. 52.*

Bi-



*Bishop, who will not maintain the Unity and the Peace of the Episcopacy.* Now I cannot think such Bishops absolutely independent, tho' they are subject to no superior Authority, who depend upon preserving the Unity and Peace of the Episcopacy, for the very Power and Dignity of Bishops.

I deny such an independency of Bishops, as makes their Churches independent, which destroys Catholick Communion, as I showed in those words which our Author suppressed, That Unity of the Catholick Church depends upon the Unity of the Episcopacy. *For it is impossible, the Catholick Church should be one Body or Society, or one Communion, if it be divided into as many independent Churches, as there are absolute and independent Bishops; for those Churches must be Independent, which have an Independent power and government, as all those must have, who have Independent Governours; or Bishops; and Independent Churches can never make one Body, and one Catholick Communion, because they are not Members of each other.* Now this Independency of Churches, which I condemn, is not opposed to a superior Jurisdiction; for so Churches, as well as Bishops, are originally Independent: but it is opposed to their being such distinct and separate Bodies as are not Members of each other, which destroys Catholick Communion, or makes it Arbitrary. And this is the Independency of Bishops which I deny; such an Independency as overthrows the unity of the Episcopacy, and consequently the unity of the Church.

Nay, I further deny the Independency of Bishops, as that signifies an exemption from all censures in case of Heresie, and Schism, and Idolatry, and such like evil practices; which does not infer a superior authority of one Bishop over another, but only an authority in the Church to censure such crimes, whoever be guilty of them; as I have already explained it at large: So that my Notion of the

the Independency of Bishops, will do no service at all to the Pope or General Council.

5. He proceeds in his charge; *The power of every Bishop in his own Diocese, is not so absolute and independent, but that he is bound to preserve the unity of the Episcopacy, and to live in Communion with his Colleagues and fellow Bishops; for this is the foundation of Catholick Communion, without which there can be no Catholick Church.* This has been accounted for already, and whoever observes, that the reason of all is laid upon the preservation of Catholick Communion, will easily guess, how little this makes for an Universal Power and Empire over the Church. He proceeds, *The whole authority of a Bishop, or Council, over other Bishops, is founded on the Laws of Catholick Communion, which is the great end it serves (and therefore it does not prove a Supreme governing Head over the Church, and therefore they have no proper authority, but only in such matters as concern the Unity of the Episcopacy, or the peace and Communion of the Catholick Church; This also has been sufficiently explained before. Again, this unity of the Episcopacy, is the foundation of these larger combinations and confederacies of Neighbour Churches; which make Archiepiscopal or National Churches: For since there is but one Episcopacy, it is highly reasonable, and necessary, so far as it is practicable, they should all act and govern their respective Churches, as one Bishop, with one consent, which is the most effectual way to secure the peace and unity of the Episcopal Colledge, and to promote the edification and good government of the Church. Nay, this unity of the Episcopacy is the foundation of that authority which Neighbour Bishops have over their Colleagues in case of Heresy and Schism, or any other notorious wickedness; for they being Bishops of the Universal Church, have an Original right and power to take care, that no part of the Church, which is within their reach and inspection, suffer by the Heresy, or evil practices of their Colleagues.*

Here

Here is a good long Quotation, if any body knew to what purpose it served. I own the Words, and know not how I could say the same thing better, if I were to say it again. I am still of the same mind, that such Combinations of Bishops for mutual Advice and Counsel, is of great benefit and use for the good Government of the Church; but if he would insinuate, (as that, if any thing, must be his design) that these Combinations of Bishops are for the exercise of Authority over their Collegues: this I absolutely deny. *They are to advise and consult with each other, not as with superior Governors, who are to determine them, and give Laws to them, but as with Friends and Collegues, of the same Body and Communion*; as I expressly affirm, Vindicat. p. 127. May not Bishops meet together for common Advice, without erecting a Sovereign Tribunal, to determine all Controversies, and make Ecclesiastical Laws, and impose them upon their Collegues, without their own consent? When though the least, yet it may be the best and wisest part of the Council are of another Mind: Is there no difference between advising with our Equals, and making them our Superiors? May it not be a very great fault, and very near the guilt of Schism, for a Bishop without any cause, but meer humour and wilfulness, to reject such Rules and Orders of Discipline and Government, which are agreed by the unanimous consent of neighbour Bishops, unless we give a Superior Authority to such Synods over their Collegues?

6. His next charge is, that the Collegue of Bishops may grant unto some one Bishop a Primacy, for the preservation of Catholick Unity and Communion, who by a general consent may be intrusted with a Superior Power of calling Synods, receiving Appeals, and exercising some peculiar Acts of Discipline under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons.

G

This

This Sentence he has made up of two places in my Book, above fifty Pages distant, p. 127 and 184, for he durst not quote either of them entire, and therefore I shall be at the pains to transcribe them both, that the indifferent Reader may judge of them. *Vind. p. 127.* There are these words, " This makes it highly reasonable for Neighbour " Bishops, at as great a distance, as the thing is practicable with ease and convenience, as the Bishops of the same " Province, or of the same Nation, to live together in a " strict Association and Confederacy; to meet in Synods, " and Provincial or National Councils, to order all the " Affairs of their several Churches by mutual Advice, and " to oblige themselves to the same Rules of Discipline and " Worship. This has been the practice of the Church " from the very beginning, and seems to be the true Original of Archi-episcopal, and Metropolitcal Churches, " which were so early, that it is most probable, they had " their beginning in the Apostles Days: For though all " Bishops have originally equal Right and Power in " Church affairs, yet there may be a Primacy of Order " granted to some Bishops, and their Chairs by a general " consent, and under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical " Canons, for the preservation of Catholick Unity and Communion, without any Antichristian encroachments or " usurpation on the Episcopal Authority.

" For (as I proceed) This Combination of Churches " and Bishops does not, and ought not to introduce a " direct Superiority of one Bishop, or Church, over another; or of such Synods and Councils over particular " Bishops: Every Bishop is the proper Governour of his " own Diocels still, and cannot be regularly imposed on " against his consent.----- If a Bishop differ from his Colleagues, assembled in Synods, or Provincial Councils, or " one National, or Provincial Council differ from another, " in

“in Matters of Prudence, and Rules of Discipline, with-  
“out either corrupting the Faith, or dividing the Church,  
“if we believe St. *Cyprian* in his Preface to the Council of  
“*Carthage*, they ought not to deny him Communion  
“upon such accounts, nor to offer any force to him in  
“such matters.

In p. 184, I discoursed much to the same purpose.  
“That for the preservation of Peace and Order in this  
“united Body, or Confederation of Neighbour Churches,  
“one or more Bishops may by a general consent be in-  
“trusted with a Superior Power of calling Synods, re-  
“ceiving Appeals, and exercising some peculiar Acts of  
“Discipline, under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Ca-  
“nons, which is the Power now ascrib'd to Archbishops  
“and Metropolitans.

“But yet, there cannot be one constitutive Ecclesi-  
“astical Regent Head in a National, much less in the U-  
“niversal Church: not Monarchical, because no one Bi-  
“shop has an original Right to Govern the rest in any  
“Nation, and therefore whatever Power may be granted  
“him by consent, yet it is not essential to the Being or  
“Unity of the Church, which is one, not by being united  
“under one superior governing Power, but by living in  
“one Communion: Not Aristocratical, because every  
“Bishop being Supream in his own Diocess, and  
“accountable to Christ for his Government, cannot, and  
“ought not, to wholly to divest himself of this Power,  
“as to be in all Cases necessarily determin'd, and over-  
“ruled by the *Major* Vote, contrary to his own Judgement  
“and Conscience.—All the Bishops in a Nation, much  
“less all the Bishops in the World, cannot unite into  
“such a Collegue, as shall by a Supream Authority,  
“govern all Bishops and Churches, by a *Major* Vote,  
“which is the form of Aristocratical Government, and



“ for the same Reason, a National Church considered as a  
 “ Church, cannot be under the Government of a Demo-  
 “ cratical Head, for if the College of Bishops have not  
 “ this Power, much less has a mixt College of Bishops  
 “ and People.

Thus careful was I to secure the Episcopal Authority from such Encroachments and Usurpations, as it now groans under in the Church of *Rome*; from placing the Unity of the Church in such a superior governing Head, whether Primate or Synod; and now let him make the best he can of this Primacy, which he should have called a *Primacy of Order*, as I did, and not absolutely a *Primacy*, which may signifie a Primacy of Power and Authority, which I positively deny he has over any of his Collegues: In a body of Equals, though there is no Superiority, there must be Order; and therefore some One must have Authority to Convene the Assembly, and to preside in it, and if the Synod see fit, may in some Cases be intrusted with a Superior Power of executing their Decrees, which involves no direct Superiority over any of his Collegues. All that I intended in these Discourses, was to shew, what Power a National or Provincial Synod, Archbishops and Metropolitans might have, upon *St. Cyprian's* Principles, without encroaching upon the Original and Essential Rights of the Episcopacy; and those who will allow *St. Cyprian's* Principles, I believe will confess, that I have truly and fairly stated the Bounds of pure Ecclesiastical Authority: If Archbishops and Metropolitans have a greater Power than this, by the Constitutions and Laws of Princes, since the Church is incorporated into the State, that I meddle not with, for it is not a pure Ecclesiastical Authority, but must be accounted for upon other Principles.

*vine Institution, and then the Combination of Churches for Catholick Communion is Divine also; and thus' National Churches, Archbishops, Metropolitans, Primates, are of Divine Institution; but had our Author transcribed the whole Sentence, every Reader would easily have seen, how little it is to his purpose: The words are these: The Patriarchal or Metropolitcal Church-Form is an Ecclesiastical Constitution, (and therefore certainly not an immediate Divine Institution) though not therefore accidental (according to the Phrase of my Dissenting Adversary,) but Catholick Communion is a Divine Institution, and therefore the Combinations of Churches for Catholick Communion is Divine also, though the particular Forms of such Combinations may be regulated and determined by Ecclesiastical Prudence, which differs somewhat from what we call meer Humane Prudence; because it is not the result of meer Natural Reason, but founded on, and accommodated to a Divine Institution.* So that herè is no Archbishop, no Primate, no particular Forms of Combinations of Churches, of Divine Institution; they are Ecclesiastical Constitutions, which may be regulated and altered by Ecclesiastical Prudence; but Catholick Communion is a Divine Institution, and therefore that Bishops and Churches should unite, for the preservation of Catholick Communion is Divine, though the particular Forms of such Combinations may be determined by Ecclesiastical Prudence, which is somewhat more Sacred than Humane Prudence, because it is founded on, and accommodated to a Divine Institution. I suppose the Reader is by this time very well satisfied about our Author's Justice in his Quotations, as the Prefacer speaks.

7. He observes, that I teach, that "a compliance with the Order, Government, Discipline, and Worship, as well as the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, " is

It is necessary to Catholick Communion. For all Christians and Christian Churches are but One Body, and are thereby obliged to all Duties, Offices, and Acts of Christian Communion, which are consequent upon such a Relation. The Catholick Church is one Body and Society, wherein all the Members there of have equal Right and Obligation to Christian Communion. Thus he puts all together as One entire Reasoning, though the parts of it are above three hundred Pages distant, as he owns in the Margin, and belong to very different things, which is a very honest way of Quoting, by which means we may make any Author speak what we please, as the History of the Gospel has been described in *Virgil's* Verse: The latter part of these words concern the Obligation of all Christians to Catholick Communion, which, what it is, I have already explained: In the former part he would insinuate, that I make it necessary to Catholick Communion, that all Churches should observe the same particular Orders, Forms of Government, Rites and Modes of Discipline and Worship; and makes me give a very senseless Reason for it, because all Christians and Christian Churches are but one Body, and are thereby obliged to all Duties, Offices, and Acts of Christian Communion, which are consequent upon such a Relation. As if Christian Churches could maintain no Communion with each other, unless they used the same Liturgy, the same Rites and Ceremonies, and were all governed by the same Ecclesiastical Canons; whereas we know, that all Churches in all Ages, have had peculiar Liturgies, peculiar Rites and Ceremonies, peculiar Fasts and Feasts, peculiar Canons, and Rules of Discipline of their own: as there are in many Cases to this day in the Church of Rome, especially among their Religious Orders.

In

In the place from which he quotes these words, I was Vindicating the Terms of Communion in the Church of England to be truly Catholick: P. 392. There are these words, "For the Terms of our Communion are as Catholick as our Church is; Diocesan Episcopacy, Liturgies, and Ceremonies, have been received in all Churches for many hundred Years, and are the settled Constitution of most Churches to this Day; and this is the Constitution of the Church of England; and the Terms of our Communion; and must be acknowledged to be Catholick Terms; if by Catholick Terms be meant, what has actually been received by the Catholick Church. After much more of this Argument, I add the words he quotes, "That though it be hard to determine, what is in its own Nature absolutely necessary to Catholick Communion; yet, I can tell him *de facto*, what is, viz. a Compliance with the Order, Government, Discipline, and Worship, as well as the Doctrine of the Catholick Church: He who will not do this, must separate from the Catholick Church, and try it at the last day, who was in the right. I am content our Dissenters should talk on of unscriptural Terms of Communion, so they will but grant, that the Church of England is no more guilty of imposing unscriptural Terms, than the Catholick Church itself has always been; and when they have confidence enough to deny this, I will prove it and shall desire no better Vindication of the Church of England, than the practice of the Catholick Church. This is so plain, that I need say nothing more to explain it, than if we will live in Catholick Communion, we must own Episcopacy, Liturgies, Ceremonies, which has been the ancient Government, Worship, Discipline, of the Church; and those who upon pretence of unscriptural Terms, separate from the Church of England; for the

Vindic. p. 396.

the sake of such Catholick Practices, by the same reason must have renounced the Communion of the best and purest, and most Catholick Churches since the Apostles Days. But how far I ever was from thinking, that the particular Rites and Modes of Worship must be the same in all Churches, and that there can be no Communion without this, any man may satisfy himself, who will be pleased to read some few Pages in the Vindication, beginning at p. 372; where I shew how impossible it is to maintain Catholick Communion, between distinct Churches, without allowing of such diversity of Rites, which are, and always were practised in different Churches.

Thus I have done with our Authour's Quotations, and what Agreement there is between us, the Reader must judge. And now he pretends to draw up my Argument against the Dissenters, which he says proceeds upon Roman-Catholick Principles: But I shall not trouble myself to examine whether my Arguments against the Dissenters were good or no, for I have no Dispute with them now, and will have none; but if they ever were good, they are not Roman-Catholick Principles, which make them so; for I have no Roman-Catholick Principle in all my Book. As for what he so often triumphs in, the late King's Paper, I tell him once for all, I will have no Dispute with Kings; but if he have any thing to say, let him fetch his Arguments, whence he will, without alledging the King's Authority to make them good, and he shall have an Answer.

And now from quoting, our Author falls to disputing me into an Agreement, which methinks argues, that we are not agreed; or at least, that I do not know we are; for what need of disputing, if as the Title of his Book says, we are agreed already, but however, the Dispute is like to be but short, and therefore we will patiently bear it.

Now



Now to trace us to St. Peters Chair, he thus begins. For by their making the Catholick Church one Body, one Household, one Kingdom, or governed Society, that has a governing and governed Part, they must necessarily be for a Catholick Hierarchy, as what alone is a fit Government for so great a Body Politick; that is, if the whole Church be one Body Politick, over which there must be one Supreme governing Head, then we must acknowledge the Authority of the Pope, or general Council, over the whole Church, which is a demonstration. But if we do not make the whole Church one such Organiz'd, Politick Body, but only one Communion (as it has appeared, we do not) then there is no necessity of one Supreme Government over the whole Church, but it is sufficient, if the Church be governed by Parts, by Bishops, who have all equal Authority, but agree in the same Communion, and govern their particular Churches by common Advice; and in this case, there is a governing, and a governed Part, but no one Supreme Head. And thus all his reasoning is at an end, for destroy this one Principle, that the whole Catholick Church is one Politick, Organiz'd Body, with one Supreme Power over the whole, and there is an end of the Authority, both of Popes, and general Councils.

But he will not give up the Cause thus, for says he, Let us therefore a little more clearly observe, what these Church of England Clergy-men affirm, and we shall find their Notion about Church Government, exactly formed according to the Roman Model. Well Sir! watch us as narrowly as you can, and see the end of it. For (says he) they say, there can be no one Catholick Communion, without one Catholick Government: But what does he mean by one Catholick Government? One superior Power over the whole Catholick Church? And who ever said this, and

H

where

where? We say, that the Unity of the Episcopacy, or the Communion and good correspondence of Bishops, is necessary to preserve Catholic Communion among their several Churches, but we never said, that *one* Catholic Government, or superior Power over the whole Church is necessary to this end. He proceeds: *And that Catholic Unity and Communion may be the more securely preserved, the Combination of Churches, considered as pure Ecclesiastical Societies, into Archbishopal and National Churches is necessary: Not absolutely necessary, but highly expedient;* but then our Author must remember withal, that these Combinations of Churches, are not for a superior Authority and Government over Bishops, but only for mutual counsel and advice, and then let him make his best of it. And so he will make what he can of it, for he adds: *So that the great end of the Combination of Diocesan into Provincial and National Churches, is the preserving Catholic Communion.* Right! remember that, that it is for Communion, not for Government, and all is well. *Which cannot be, but by raising the Combination higher, and extending it much farther, even unto Patriarchal, and at last into one oecumenical combined Church, for this alone is consensurage to Catholic Communion.* Well! suppose then, that all the Bishops in the World could meet together for counsel and advice, as the Bishops of a Province or Nation can, and had just such an Oecumenical as there are national Primates, what service would this do the Church of Rome? For here is no Supreme Power all this while over the Universal Church, neither Pope nor general Council: Here is no Oecumenical Pastor, no Supreme Tribunal, which all the World is bound to obey. For as I have already shown, we do not make a Primate or National Synod, the constitutive Regent Head of a National Church, but only a great Council for mu-

tual

tual Advice; and therefore were there such an Oecumenical Primacy, and Oecumenical Council, yet it would as vastly differ from the *Roman Model*, as a Council for Advice, and a Council for Government; as an Oecumenical Head and Pastor, and the President of an Oecumenical Council; and the Church of *Rome* is at a very low ebb, if it can be contented with such a Primacy, and such a Council as this, which essentially differ from what the Councils of *Constantinople* and *Nice* themselves attribute to Popes and Councils. But besides this, if such an Oecumenical combination of Bishops and Churches cannot be, and there be no need of it to Catholic Communion, then I suppose, our Author will grant, that the Argument from a National combination of Churches, and a National Primacy, to an Oecumenical Combination of Churches, and an Oecumenical Primacy, is not good.

1. Then this cannot be, and that for this plain Reason, because all the Bishops of the Christian Church cannot meet together from all parts of the World; and if they could, they ought not to forsake their Churches for so long a time as such a Journey, and such a Consultation requires. But you say, every Nation may spare some Bishops, to send with full Authority to the Council, as the Representatives of all the rest. This I take to be next to a Moral Impossibility; I am sure it was never yet done; there never was such a Council, as had some Bishops from all parts of the Christian World. But suppose this could be done, these Bishops, who meet in Council, could represent No Body but themselves, and therefore can make no such Decrees, as by their own Authority shall oblige all the other Bishops, who were not present. For a Bishop is not a representable Person. He is the Supreme Governor in his own Diocese, and cannot, and ought not, to be imposed on without his own

consent; his Trust and Office and Power is Personal, and so is his account; and therefore he can no more be represented in a Council, than he can at the Day of Judgment: every Man's Conscience and Soul must be in his own keeping; and therefore can be represented by no Man. Had the Representatives of the Catholick Church, a Divine Authority, superior to all particular Churches and Bishops, to oblige them to stand to their Decrees, as the Church of *Rome* asserts a general Council has, then indeed some few Bishops chose by their National and Provincial Bishops, to go to the Council, and to Act as the Representatives of such Churches, might have a plenary Authority to debate and determine all Matters in Dispute, whether relating to Faith, or Worship, or Discipline: But such an Authority as this, he knows we absolutely deny, and assert that Councils are only for mutual Advice, and can oblige no Bishops without their personal assent, and this makes it ridiculous to talk of Representatives, in giving and taking Advice, which is a personal Act, and requires every Man's own Judgment, and his personal Assent.

I deny not but it may be of great Use for Christian Princes and Emperors, to summon such Councils as these, as *Constantine* and other succeeding Emperors did; for there was no such thing, as what we call a General Council, till *Constantine* summoned the first Council at *Nice*. For Christian Princes and Emperors are concerned to encourage and support the true Christian Faith and Worship; and they are as much concerned not to be misguided in these Matters, which instead of Nursing Fathers, may make them Persecutors of the true Church: And to prevent this, they cannot take a better way, when the Church is divided by Schisms and Heresies, then to summon such a great Council, where the Matters in

Dis-



Dispute may be freely debated ; but I look upon these rather to be Councils of the Empire, than of the Church which have no other Authority, but what either the Imperial Sanctions give them, or what every Church gives them, by receiving their Decrees : And it is evident from Ecclesiastical Story, that they bear Authority of these Councils never put an end to any one Dispute, any farther than they were backed by the Imperial Power : which is an Argument, that they did not believe in those days, such Councils to be Infallible, or to be the Supream Tribunal of the Christian Church. They were indeed Supream Tribunals, when Princes made them so, but not by any meer Ecclesiastical Authority and Jurisdiction ; If then a Council of Bishops be onely for mutual Advice, and a Council for Advice requires the personal Presence of all Bishops, and though all the Bishops of one Province, or one Nation, may conveniently enough meet together for Advice, yet, all the Bishops of the World cannot ; then I think it is plain, that the Consequence from a National to an Oecumenical Council, is not good. especially,

adly, Since there is no need of it to Catholick Communion. The Christian Churches maintained a very strict Alliance and Communion with each other, for above Three Hundred Years without it : Catholick Communion was better preserved then, than ever it has been since, which is a demonstration, that such a Supream governing Power over the whole Church is not necessary to Catholick Communion, for then Catholick Communion could never have been maintained without it ; and yet, thus it was in St. Cyprian's days, who was as Zealous an Asserter of Catholick Communion, as any before or since.

In those days, the Bishops of Neighbour Churches frequently met together, to Advise about the general Concernments



cerments of the Church, and if any thing hapned, which concerned the Discipline of the whole Church, as it did in St. *Cyprian's* days, about the case of the lapsed, and rebaptizing those who had been baptized by Hereticks; they sent their Letters to Forreign Churches, and took their Advice about it, and by this means did more perfectly understand one anothers Judgments and Reasons, and came to a better accord and agreement, than they could have done, had they met in a General Council, consisting onely of some few Representative Bishops.

*Maximè cum jampridem nobiscum & cum omnibus omnino Episcopis in toto mundo constitutis etiam Cornelius Collega noster decreverit — Cyp. ep. 68. Pam.*

*Cum quo nobis totus orbis commercie formatum in una communione societate concordat. Opt. l. 2.*

I am sure by this means St. *Cyprian* says their Decrees were confirmed by all the Bishops in the World; and *Optatus* says, that this Catholick Communion was maintained all the World over, by formed and

communicatory Letters: It seems, they did not think then, that one governing Head was necessary to Catholick Communion; and therefore, though Catholick Communion does require the Union of Neighbour Churches into one Combined Church: it does not require such an Union and Combination of all the Churches in the World.

Thus I have particularly answered this Author's charge, excepting his vain Repetitions of the same Cavils, without giving any new force or strength to them, and I think any ordinary Reader may see, how far I am from setting up the supreme Authority, either of Pope or General Council over the Universal Church, and how impossible it is to graft such consequences upon my Principles, with any shew or pretence of Reason.

And now as for his *French* Popery, let it be what it will, I am unconcerned in it, since I give no Supreme Authority neither to Pope nor General Council, and there.

therefore neither agree with the *Italian*, nor *Spanish*, nor *French*, nor any Popery, of what denomination soever. But I must add a word or two about *Petrus de Marca*, because it seems my Honesty and Credit is very much concerned in this matter, so deeply, that no man ought ever to believe me more; and though I suppose the Reader sees, what credit he is to give to this Author, yet I must speak at least a good word for my own honesty: and to do that, I must give a brief account of the occasion of my alledging the Authority of *Petrus de Marca*.

I was charged by my dissenting Adversaries, with a *Cassandrian* design, for setting up, as they apprehended, the Authority of a General Council. For there is not one word, which this Author has objected against me, but what was before objected by the Dissenters, and answered in the Vindication. Now having shewn them their mistake in this Charge, that I had asserted nothing which did infer the Authority of a General Council, as the Supreme Regent Head of the Catholick Church, I over and above shewed them how vain this Charge of *Cassandrian* or *French* Popery was, though I had given such an Authority to a General Council. For merely to assert the Authority of a General Council, does not make any man a Papist of no sort whatsoever, unless he assert the Authority of the Pope: for though there be some disputes, whose Authority is greatest, the Popes, or the Councils, yet no man is a Papist, who does not own the Pope to be the Supreme and Oecumenical Pastor; and therefore I having expressly disowned all Authority of the Pope or Bishop of *Rome*, though I had owned the Authority of a General Council, I could be no Papist, not so much as a *Cassandrian* or *French* Papist. So that this is the thing I was to prove, that there is no Papist, but owns the

See Vindicat.  
p. 131. &c.

Cassand. Con-  
suls. de ponti-  
fici Rom.

the Pope to be the Supream Head of the Church, the Universal and Occumenical Pastor. This I proved *Cassander* did; who asserts, That to the Unity of the Catholick Church, is required Obedience to One Supream Governour, who succeeds Peter in the government of Christ's Church, and in the Office of feeding his Sheep--and that it is evident from all the Records of the Church, that the chief Authority of the Universal Church has always been yielded to the Bishop of Rome, as Peter's Successor, who sits in his Chair. This I proved also of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, That though they decreed the Council to be above the Pope, yet they asserted the Popes Supream Pastorship. That all particular men and particular Churches, are bound to obey the Pope, unless in such matters as are prejudicial to this holy Synod, or any other which is lawfully assembled; as the Council of *Basil* expressly teaches. And this was all I undertook to prove of the French Church, That whatever Liberties they pretended, still they owned the Pope to be the Supream Pastor and Head of the Universal Church; for which I appealed to *Petrus de Marca*. Let us then consider what is my Fault.

Agreem. p. 18.  
&c.

Our Author gives us an account, that the French Church teaches, as the Council of *Basil* did, That though the Pope be greater than particular Churches and Bishops, yet he is not greater than the whole Universal Church; and that the Authority that is granted him in the Interval of Councils--doth not in the least suppose him to have any Superiority or Prebeminence above the Universal Church: whence it is, that whenever from the Ecclesiastical Courts in France, any References, Suggestions, or Consultations, were made to the Pope, if the Popes Rescripts were contrary to the old Canons, the French always looked on it as abusive, and made an Appeal from the Pope called *Appellatio ab Abusu*, provoking him to the old Canons. Now he says,  
Dr.

Dr. Sherlock is bold enough to deny all, and to bring no less person than the Venerable Petrus de Marca for his Teacher. But where do I deny one word of this, or alledge Petrus de Marca's authority to prove it. I had no occasion to deny this; for all that I was to prove was, that the French Church did own the Pope to be the Supreme Head and Governour of the Church, and that they did so, I proved from Petrus de Marca: Does not then Petrus de Marca say, what I charge him with? Yes, that he owns: What is my fault then? Why truly, only that I say, that Petrus de Marca wrote in defence of the Liberties of the Gallican Church; and is not this the Title of his Book? *De Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii, seu de Libertatibus Ecclesie Gallicane*: Of the Agreement of the Priesthood and the Empire, or of the Liberties of the Gallican Church. Yes, this he grants; but the Archbishop was perswaded to add this Title by the Bookseller, to make it sell the better; and I ought to have known for all this, if I had looked any farther than Titles and Margins, that he wrote against the Liberties of the Gallican Church; and will he say, that I ought to have said so too? There had been a great piece of modesty indeed, as great as it is in this Author, whoever he be, I am sure very inconsiderable, in comparison of this great man, to charge him with down-right Knavery.

For my part, I am of that mind still, that the Archbishop, who was as great a man as that Age bred, did firmly believe, that he had truly stated the Liberties of the Gallican Church, though he differed from some, who had stretched those Liberties very much, to the prejudice of the Roman See; which the King himself expressed his

*Marce per Archiepiscopum Burdegalem*  
*inquit in hac Imperatoris, ut adversus Omnia libellum (quasi in alio) scribitur, sed in methodo, ne libertates Ecclesie Gallicane, quas per latum, non occide perhas, optatus, aliquam paterentur injuriam; quoniam id scilicet ageret, ut omnes intelligerent, libertates illas sibi servare de reverentia, que debetur Romano sedi, quam per vultus Imperatoris non debent esse confusum, et maxime retinuerunt. Baluz.*  
 Petr. de Mar.

sense of, when he imposed that task on him of writing this Book, for he charged him to take care, that the *Gallican* Liberties might suffer no Injury, and that he should let all men see, that these Liberties did not diminish that Reverence, which the *French* have most constantly maintained for the *Roman* See above all other Nations; from whence also we may observe, that the Subject he was to write on by the Kings Command, were the *Gallican* Liberties, which was therefore a proper Title for his Book, though he was unwilling to have given it that Title for fear of offending the Court of *Rome*, as it accordingly hapned; and he was to take care so to assert the *Gallican* Liberties, as not to detract from that Reverence, which the *French* Church, as the King affirms, has always paid to the *Roman* See. This Province he undertook, and discharged to the abundant satisfaction of that King, who employed him, who was jealous enough of the *Gallican* Liberties, as far as they were consistent with the Reverence of the Apostolick See: but this work was not so well relished at *Rome*; for as the King rewarded him with a Bishoprick for it, so the Court of *Rome* kept him out of it for several Years; and one would guess by this Usage he met with at *Rome*, that they had a very jealous eye on these *Gallican* Liberties, even as *De Marca* had stated them.

Agreement,  
p. 33.

But our Author observes that *Baluzius* who wrote *De Marca's* Life, positively affirms, that none amongst the *French*, no, nor amongst the *Spanish* and *Italian* did more eloquently, and with greater Authority of the Ancients, exalt the *Roman* Chair to a greater height than *De Marca* did. This *Baluzius* does not say so absolutely as our Author reports; but adds a Qualification, which he out of his great Exactness in quoting, thought fit to leave out, viz. *quomodo intra limites aequi constitit*, that no man



man who kept within the bounds of Equity and Moderation, ever exalted the Authority of the Roman Bishop more : which argues, that *De Marca* did not fly so high, as some Flatterers of the Roman Greatness have done, but yet gave him as great Power as any man could honestly give him ; and this I hope he might do without betraying the Gallican Liberties. Tho' as *Baluzius* observes, the Romans, whose Ears are very tender in such matters, could not bear the Title of his Book of the Liberties of the Gallican Church, for they suspected, that he must be an Enemy to the Ecclesiastical Liberties, who wrote professedly for the Liberties of the Gallican Church, which he brands with a *probrum* ! as a thing ridiculous and absurd.

*Offendit tamen (quis crederet) hic liber Romana ingenia, nullam aliam ob causam ut Marca existimabat, quod in fronte operis admoneret, hic agi de libertatibus ec-*

*clesiæ Gallicanæ. Unde Romanis (quorum aures teneritudine quendam plus trahuntur) promptum fuit sibi persuadere, illum libertati ecclesiasticæ adversari, qui de libertatibus ecclesiæ Gallicanæ (probrum nefas!) agebat ex professo. Baluz. in vita Petri de Marca. p. 9.*

In the same place, *Baluzius* falls severely upon *Faget*, who also wrote the Life of *De Marca*, for making him a Deserter and betrayer of the Gallican Liberties : He gives an Account of the Roman Arts, to persuade him to condemn some parts of his Book, and to insinuate that the mistakes of that Book of Concord were not owing to his own Will and Choice, but to the importunate Commands and Ambition of others ; this Condition he absolutely refused, though it was proposed by Cardinal *Barberini* as the easiest Expedient to obtain a dispatch of his Affairs at Rome. This he was frequently solicited to, and as constantly refused, firmly resolving while he was in health rather to renounce all Right and Claim to his Bishoprick, than remit any of the Privileges of the Gallican Church, till at last they taking advantage of a great fit of Sickness, when his mind might be supposed as weak as his Body ; he subscribed a Paper, wherein he recanted every thing in his Book, which was contrary to

the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Immunity, as it was taught by the Church of *Rome*, an account of which *Balz.* gives us in his *Life*, p. 16. 17. From whence it appears, that though *De Marca* did not so much depress the Pope, nor extend the *Gallican Liberties*, as some *French Lawyers* had done, yet he honestly and sincerely maintained with constancy and resolution (excepting this subscription in his sickness,) against all the Arts and Solicitations of the Church of *Rome*, what he thought to be the true Liberties of the *Gallican Church*; and this surely was reason enough for me to say, (as he himself says in the Title of his Book, and as the *French King*, and the Court of *Rome* thought he did) that he wrote for the Liberties of the *Gallican Church*, how our Author will defend himself for saying that he wrote against them, with any modesty and reverence for the Honesty, Learning and Judgment of that great man, he had best consider: I cannot pretend to understand the *Gallican Liberties* so well, as to say, who is in the Right; but I would still prefer the Judgment of *De Marca*, who was both a great Lawyer and a great Divine, before any of his Adversaries.

And yet I was not concerned to judge of this matter, whether *De Marca* or the Pragmaticks were in the right, where they differ from each other; all that I alleadged his Authority for, as I observed before, was to prove, that the *Gallican Liberties* did not exclude the Authority of the Pope, as Christ's Vicar, and St. *Peter's* Successor in the Government of the Church. This is what the Council of *Basil* it self owns; and to deny it, would be an Ecclesiastical Liberty with a witness, but not a Popish, but a Protestant Liberty. This is my Crime, which he says, Ought to be a caution to all Readers, how they take up any thing upon trust from me; and though I have

have done nothing to forfeit my Credit yet, I do not desire any Readers should trust me, but see with their own Eyes; and if they would serve us all so, I know what would become of such Writers as this Author. And he wishes it may be a means to engage me to more modesty, and an abatement of my *contemporaneous way of writing* (if I write any more) for the time to come. I perceive he thought, this discovery would have broke my heart for ever; but I have ventured to write once more, and may do so again, and very modestly too, when I meet with modest Adversaries. I thank God I condemn no man living, but it is a little in my nature to condemn Knavery and Nonfence; and therefore if our Author tastes a little of it still, I must beg his pardon, for I cannot help it. As for what follows, I have nothing to say to it, it is all a Dispute against the Pope's Supremacy, which I like very well; only I wonder, if he be in good earnest, why the Oath of Supremacy should stick in his teeth. I have only one Request to him, to tell me, which was the Infallible Council, that of *Basil*, or *Trent*: for the first subjects the Pope to a Council, the last makes him superior to it; and it were very strange, if Contradictions should be Infallible.

A N  
**A N S W E R**  
 TO THE  
 Necessity of A G R E E M E N T  
 Between the  
**Church of England**  
 AND THE  
**CHURCH of R O M E, &c.**

**B**Efore I proceed to Answer his second Section of the *Agreement between the two Churches about some of their imposed Terms of Communion*, I shall in a few words rid my hands of that terrible Appendix which the Prefacer ascribes to another Author, to prove the *Necessity of an Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, evidenced from the Nature and Constitution of a National Church, Episcopally Establish'd*. Thus first they prove, that we are agreed, and then they prove, that there is a necessity we should agree: But what need to prove that we must agree, did they believe, that we were already agreed? So that this Appendix

dix is indeed a confutation of the Book which he Entitles, *An Agreement between the Church of England and Church of Rome*: Whereas this proves, that of necessity we ought to agree, if we will be true to our Principles; which supposes, that whatever our Principles are, we are not yet agreed. How well he has proved our Agreement, I have already shewn, and now shall briefly examine how he proves our Necessity of Agreement.

But I must observe by the way, that though the Prefacer does ascribe this learned Piece to another Author, yet he has concealed the true Father: His other Author is a good *Roman Catholick*, who disputes in good earnest from the *Subordination of Pastors in the Church*, to prove the *Supremacy of an Oecumenic or Universal Pastor*; but the true Author was an Independent Protestant, from whom this honest Romanist borrows every Argument, and almost every word, excepting such little variations as a Papist must of necessity make in an Independent's Writing, without ever confessing his Benefactor, or owning from whence he had it. The Title of the Book is, *The Catholick Hierarchie, or the Divine Right of a Sacred Dominion in Church and Conscience, truly Stated, Asserted, and Pleaded*. Printed for Sam. Crouch at the Printers Arms in Pope's Head-Alley in Cornhil, and Tho. Fox at the Angel in Westminster-hall, 1681. In the 14 Chap. of which Book, p. 76. being a Digression concerning the *Subordination of Pastors*; whoever has the curiosity may find this entire Treatise of the Necessity of Agreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, onely with this difference, that the Independent disputes against the Subordination of Pastors by this very Argument, *That the Asserting the Subordination of Pastors in the Church, doth by all good consequence infer the Supremacy of an Oecumenical or Universal Pastor*.

This



This Popish Plagiary takes his Book, and makes a quite contrary use of it, to prove from the subordination of Pastors, which is and ought to be in the Church, as the Church of *England* owns, the necessity of owning an Oecumenical Pastor, they both indeed dispute against the Church of *England*, but the first Author disputes for Independency, the Plagiary for Popery. Now why might not the Independent, had he not had more Wit than his Transcriber, have entituled his Chapter, The Necessity of Agreement between the Church of *England* and Independents, because they both agree in rejecting an Oecumenical Pastor, and therefore ought to agree in rejecting the subordination of Pastors, which infers an Oecumenical Pastor; as well as this Author calls it, A Necessity of Agreement between the Church of *England* and Church of *Rome*, because they both agree in the subordination of Pastors, and therefore, as he thinks, ought to agree in an Oecumenical Pastor. Nay, he had but served his Independent Author right, had he stiled it, The Necessity of Agreement between the Independents, and the Church of *Rome*, because they both agree in this Principle, that if there be a subordination of Pastors, there ought to be an Oecumenical Pastor, which is the nearest Popery of any Principle I know; for there is nothing to be done in order to this Agreement, but to prove a subordination of Pastors, which is a thousand times easier, than to make good that Consequence from a subordination of Pastors, to an Oecumenical Pastor.

But let this Author make the best he can of his Independent Arguments, and call his Book what he pleases, my business is only to show, that there is no necessity for those, who acknowledge a subordination of Pastors, to acknowledge an Oecumenical Pastor. And before I consider his reasons in particular, I shall make short work

with

with them, and confute them altogether. The querie he proposes to discuss, which he has transcribed *verbatim* from his Independent Author, is this :

*Whether the asserting of the Subordination of Pastors in the Church, doth not by all good consequence, necessarily infer the Supremacy of an Oecumenic or Universal Pastor.* Now my exception against this, and consequently against all

Agreement,  
p. 61.  
The Catholick  
Hierarchy,  
p. 77.

his Arguments, whereby he proves this, is, that I will allow of no consequences to prove an Institution. No man can have the Authority of an Universal Pastor, unless Christ has given it him; and therefore unless Christ have appointed such an Universal Pastor, there can be none: and to prove by consequence, that Christ has appointed one, when no such Institution appears, is ridiculous. Suppose then, there were as much reason for the Supremacy of an Oecumenical Bishop over all the Bishops in the World, as there is for the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, which is all the Subordination of Pastors, that we allow, of which more presently; yet at most this can onely prove, that there ought to be an Oecumenical Bishop, and that Christ ought to have appointed one; but it don't prove that there is one: And therefore he, who believes that the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters is an Apostolical Institution, but can find no such Institution of an Universal Bishop, can never be forced by any reason or consequence, to own such an Universal Bishop. We own the Subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, not from Reason, but Institution; and does it then hence follow, that we must own the Supremacy of an Universal Bishop, for some pretended Reasons without an Institution? What is matter of Institution depends wholly upon the Divine Will and Pleasure; and though all men will grant, that God and Christ have always great reason for their Institutions, yet it is not the Reason, but the Au-

merity which makes the Institution: Though we do not understand the reasons of the Institution, if we see the Command, we must obey; and though we could fancy a great many reasons why there should be such an Institution, if no such Institution appears, we are free, and ought not to believe there is such an Institution, because we think there are reasons to be assigned why it should be: And thus in our case, though we should not shew why Christ should institute the Apostolical Office and Power (to which ordinary power Bishops succeed) superior to Presbyters, and not institute an Oecumenical Pastor superior to all Bishops; though we should fancy that there is as much reason for the one as there is for the other, yet if there appear to be an Institution of the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, and no Institution of an Oecumenical Pastor, we may safely own what is instituted, and deny what is not instituted, what ever parity of reason there is between them. And this, I think, plainly shews that the Church of *England* may own the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters, and yet deny any such Officer as an Oecumenical Pastor, because there is an Institution of one, and not of the other.

But that our Author (if we may call a notorious Plagiarist so) may not complain, that we will not hear him, I shall briefly examin, what he says.

He begins with explaining what is meant by *Church*, by *Subordination of Pastors*, and by an *Oecumenical Pastor*.

I. As for the first, he distinguishes between a *Church* and the *Church*; A *Church* is any particular Church; The *Church* belongs to the *Catholic Church* only. Why, *Is* is not a Church, though it be a particular Church, the Church of *England*, the Church of *France*, the Church of *Spain*? The Church of *England* is not the Universal Church,

Church, no more than the Church of Rome, but it is the Church of England. But what he would make of this, I cannot well guess. He says, *Men are frightened into Conformity to the impositions of any particular Church, upon supposition that they are the Laws of the Church, i.e. the Catholic Church, as the People do for the most part believe.* But I perceive he thinks, that our People in England are as silly as they are in some other places; but we tell them, and every body of common sense understands without telling, that when we in England exhort them to obey the Laws of the Church, we mean only the Laws of the Church of England; and he ought first to have proved, that every National Church has not power to give Laws to her own Members, before he had represented this, as such a meer Scare-crow; for his distinction between A and The Church, does not prove that a Church, or every particular National or Diocesan Church, if he pleases, has not Authority over her own Members. This he himself dares not deny, and therefore distinguishes between obeying a Church, as the Church, and as a Church; but though we do grant a difference between the Universal and a Particular Church, yet before he had run down the Authority of particular Churches, he ought to have proved such a Superior Authority in the Universal Church, to which all particular Churches must be subordinate: But here his Author failed him, and therefore he must of necessity fail his Readers.

1. By Subordination of Pastors he understands the standing of several men in distinct Orders, or Degrees of Office, one above another, or under another in Subordinate Ranks. This he applies to Patriarchates, National, Provincial, Diocesan, Churches; the Romanists he says never stop till they arrive at the most Catholic Visible Church and Pastor in the World, i.e. an Occumenical Pastor: The Prote-

*Plant Prelates and Doctors: (who go not Dr Sherlock's way)* do say, that there are no degrees of Subordination in the ascending part, above a National Church and Pastor. I have already defended my way, which this Author, I find, knows nothing of, no more than he does what is the sense of Protestant Prelates in this matter: and therefore I must tell him, that though we do own a Subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, yet we own no Subordination of one Bishop to another, but do assert with *St Cyprien*, That all Bishops have originally the same Authority and Power! what the meaning is of Metropolitcal and National Combinations of Churches, and how far we are from setting up a *National Supreme Pastor* with a kind of a *National Infallibility*, as he insinuates, I have already shewn at large: Though I think there never was a more senseless Suggestion, that no Church can exercise any Authority and Jurisdiction, nor punish the Disobedient, without pretending to Infallibility, which would overthrow all Government in the World, unless Princes, and Parents, and Masters be Infallible too: And the reason he gives of it is as absurd to the full; that *it is the most unjust and unreasonable thing in the World for me to pretend to force another to believe and practise that which I am not assured to be truth*: As if no man could be certain of any thing without Infallibility. Now all his Arguments proceeding upon this Mistake, that we own a Superiority of one Bishop over another, that Bishops own Obedience and Subjection to Archbishops and Primates, and they to Patriarchs; whereas we own no such thing, but teach, that all Bishops are equal, as I have already explained it; and that these combinations of Bishops into Archiepiscopal and National Churches, are not for direct acts of Government and Superiority over each other, but for mutual Advice and Counsel: All his Arguments from the Superior



perious Power of Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Patriarchs, to prove that there must be an Universal Pastor, fall with it.

3. By an Oecumenic Pastor, he means the Universal Visible Ruling Head of the Catholick Organized Church Militant. This is easily understood; the only difficulty is to prove, that the Catholick Church is such an organized body, as must have an universal visible ruling Head.

And thus I come to his Reasons, whereby he proves, that the Subordination of Pastors in the Church, does necessarily infer the Supremacy of an Oecumenick or Universal Pastor:

1. His first Argument is, that *there is the same Politick Reason for an Universal Pastor, that there is for any subordinate Pastor, that hath Pastors subjected unto him.* Now suppose this were true, we do not find the original right of Government, of superiority and subjection between the Pastors of the Church, upon any politick Reasons, but only upon Institution; and therefore though the Politick Reasons were the same, if the Institution be not the same, that makes an essential difference, and spoils all the Arguments from a parity of Reason.

The only Subordination we allow of, is the Subordination of Presbyters to their Bishops, and that we found on an Apostolick Institution, and if we will speak in the Ancient Language, this is not the Subordination of one Pastor to another: for none were called the Pastors of the Church in St. Cyprian's days but Bishops, who are the Apostles Successors, to whom Christ intrusted the care of feeding his Sheep. For though Presbyters are intrusted with the care of the Flock, yet they are not compleat Pastors, because they are under the direction and government of their Bishop in the Exercise of their Ministry, and according to Ignatius his Rule must do

nothing without him: but Bishops are the Supreme Governours and Pastors of their particular Churches, and we allow of no Subordination of Bishops, that is, of Pastors, to each other. This our Transcriber was sensible of, and therefore here he leaves his Copy: The Independent Author gives his first instance in a *Diocesan Bishop* ruling his *Parish Priests* or *parochial Pastors*, the chief end of the said Bishop being Jurisdiction, determination of Ecclesiastical Causes, regulation and ordination of his Clergy, unity, order, uniformity. Now our Popish Transcriber was sensible, that there was not such a Subordination between Bishops, as there is of Presbyters to Bishops, and therefore he changes a *Diocesan Bishop* into a *Provincial Pastor* ruling his *Diocesan Bishops*, and regulation and ordination of his Clergy into regulating Abuses, and Consecration of Bishops. So that he was conscious to himself, that there is not the same politick reason for the Subordination of Bishops to each other, that there is for the Subordination of Presbyters to their Bishops, which is the only Subordination we own, and thus I might dismiss his first Argument.

But is there not a Subordination of Bishops to Archbishops allowed and practised in the Church of England, and interwoven with the Constitution of it; and if this be thought necessary to the unity and good government of a National Church, is there not greater need for a *principium unitatis & regiminis*, a principle of unity and government in conjoyning many National Churches in one Patriarchal, or all in one Oecumenic, as for uniting Provincials in one Primateship, or for subjecting Diocessans to their respective Provincials? This is the whole force of the Argument, which I have sufficiently answered already, but shall briefly consider it again.

Then

1. Then I observe, that whatever superiority or jurisdiction Archbishops challenge over Bishops, it is but a Humane Institution; for all Bishops, with respect to the original Institution of Episcopacy, are equal: and therefore the superiority of Archbishops over Bishops cannot prove, that Christ has appointed a Supreme Pastor over the whole Church, and all the Bishops of it; for Christ has not made an Archbishop superiour to a Bishop, much less a Pope superior to them all. So that at most, if they proceed upon this Argument, they must quit all pretence to a Divine Right, and confess the Pope to be as very a Humane Creature as an Archbishop is, and then we know what to say to them.

2. For the being and authority of Archbishops, and consequently of such an Oecumenical Bishop, is not necessary and essential to the unity of the Church, as no Humane Institution can be: Christ Instituted his Church, which is but one Church, without Archbishops and Metropolitans, and consequently without an Oecumenical Bishop, and therefore they cannot be necessary to the unity of the Church. For if Christ instituted this one Church in a parity of Bishops, it must be one without such a superiority, as is only of Humane institution. The Church cannot be one without the essential principle of unity, and if an Oecumenical Pastor be this essential principle of unity, then either he must be appointed by Christ, and so his institution does not result from a parity of reason with the Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Authority, which were not Instituted by Christ, and then this Argument is lost; or else Christ instigated one Church without the essential principle of unity, which is as great an absurdity as to say, that there can be one Church without a principle of unity.

3. As the Archiepiscopal and Patriarchal Authority is  
ori-

originally of Humane Institution, so it is plain, that before the Church was incorporated into the State, and it may be some time after, it did not give a direct Authority and jurisdiction to one Bishop over another: For St. *Cyprian*, who was a Primate himself, disowns such an authority, as makes them Bishops of Bishops; and in St. *Jeromes* time the Bishop was the highest order in the Church; and of what place soever they were Bishops, they were all Equal, which is a contradiction, if one had a direct superiority over another; and therefore such combinations of Bishops (as I have often observed) were not essential to the unity of the Church, but were a good prudential means to maintain a strict alliance between Neighbour Bishops, was very useful for mutual advice and council; gave great authority to Church Discipline, when every particular Bishop, though he had the supreme Authority in his own Church, yet did not act merely upon his own Head, but with the consent and advise of the whole Province, or Patriarchate, which confirmed the Authority of every Bishop, when those, who were duly censured by their Bishop, saw it in vain to complain to other Bishops, who all observed the same rules of Discipline: and an Archbishop or Primate was very necessary in such combinations, not for unity and government, but for order, as it is in all other Bodies and Societies of men: at least not for any acts of Government over their fellow Bishops, but such as did belong in common to them all, as ordaining Bishops for vacant Sees, or composing such differences as the single Authority of the Bishop could not compose in his own Diocess.

4. I readily grant, that since the Church is Incorporated into the State, Archbishops and Metropolitans have a greater and more direct Authority over their Collegues, as far as the Canons of the Church confirmed by the Supreme

preme National Authority extend: but whatever is more than I have now explained, is not a pure Ecclesiastical Authority, but a mixt Authority derived from the Civil Powers, and this may be greater or less, as the Civil Powers please. All compulsory jurisdiction must be derived from the Civil Powers, because the Church has none of her own; and when the Church is incorporated into the State, as it is very fitting, that the Ecclesiastical Authority should be enforced by the Civil Authority, so those, who have the exercise of this Ecclesiastical Authority, seem the fittest persons to be entrusted with such a Civil Jurisdiction, as is thought convenient to give force to it: which is the true original of that mixt Authority, which the Bishops and Archbishops now exercise by the Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Land.

But though this justifies the Archiepiscopal or Metropolitcal Authority over a National Church, yet it is a demonstration, that there can be no such Oecumenical Pastor, as there is a National Archbishop, unless we could find an Universal Monarch too, as well as a King of *England*, of *France* or *Spain*; for otherwise, whence should this Universal Pastor derive his Oecumenic Authority, unless there be an Universal Prince? Meerly considered as a Bishop, he has no Superiority or Jurisdiction over any of his Collegues or fellow Bishops; and he can never have such a Jurisdiction over the Universal Church, as a Metropolitan has over a National Church, unless there be an Universal King to give this Universal Authority to him, as there is the King of *England*, of *France*, or *Spain*, to give such a National Authority to their Patriarchs and Primates: Whereas the Pope of *Rome* is so far from deriving his Authority from Secular Princes, that he challenges a Superiour Authority over them and their Subjects in their own Dominions: Which shews how



senseless it is to infer the Authority of an Universal Bishop or Pastor from the Authority of a National Primate, because they cannot derive their Authority the same way, there being no Universal Monarch to give him such Authority; and the Bishop of *Rome*, who alone challenges this Universal Pastorship, is so far from owning such a Title to it, that he assumes an Authority over Sovereign Princes. And therefore though it may be pardonable in an *Independent* to use such an Argument for the Pope's Authority, I know not how our Popish Plagiary will come off with it; for it effectually overthrows all pretences to a Papal Supremacy, to derive it from no higher Principle than what gives being to a National Primacy, which is not the Institution of Christ, but the Authority of Sovereign Princes, and Civil Powers; which the Pope cannot have, and if he could, would think scorn to receive his Power from them: For that would spoil his claim as Christ's Vicar, and *St. Peter's* Successor; and they who give can take away too.

5. But setting aside all this, there is not a parity of reason for an Oecumenic Pastor, and a National Primate, neither of them are necessary to the Unity of the Church, which is preserved by the concord and agreement of Bishops, not by such a governing Authority and superiour Power of one Bishop over another: As for Advice and Counsel, such a National combination of Bishops under a Metropolitan, may be of great use, because all the Bishops in a Nation may without any inconvenience meet together; but there is not the same reason for an Universal Bishop, because all the Bishops in the World cannot meet together in Council with him, as I have already discoursed. And as for some peculiar acts of Authority and Jurisdiction, especially where there is a mixture of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Authority; this may very prudent-

dently be intrusted with a National Primate: But it is both an intolerable grievance, which has been complained of by *Roman* Catholick Princes and People, that Appeals should lie to *Rome*, and the Bishops and People of all Nations in the World, be forced to have their Causes heard there; and it is a derogation from the Authority of Sovereign Princes, to have a Foreign Bishop exercise a superiour Jurisdiction in their own Kingdoms. This I think is sufficient, if men be reasonable, to answer his first Politick Reason for an Universal Pastor.

2. His next Argument is very Comical; the whole of which he has borrowed also from his Independent Author, though sometimes he ventures upon new Phrases, and new Illustrations, which make it more comical still: *He proves, that they that maintain the Government of the Church by Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, &c. must also own and acknowledge an Universal Visible Pastor, from the nature of an Universal Visible Church.* This may be true for ought I know; for who can tell but his &c. which is all he has added to the Original, may include an Universal Pastor? But his Argument is fallaciously put, (which I confess is none of his fault, but his Author's, whom he has honestly Copied) it should have been this, those who assert *the Government of the Church by Bishops, Archbishops, Primates*, (though he should have left out Bishops, as he did in his former Argument, because their Authority is of a distinct consideration from Archbishops and Primates) *from the nature of an Universal Visible Church, must also own an Universal Visible Pastor from the nature of an Universal Visible Church*: For if we do not derive the Authority of Archbishops and Primates, from the nature and essential Constitution of the Catholick Church, as it is evident we do not; how can the nature of the *Universal Visible Church*, force us to own an Universal Pastor, when it

*Agrim. p. 67.  
Cath. Hist. p. 79.*

does not force us to own a National Primacy. If there be such a connexion between them, that the consequence holds from one to the other, we must own them both for the same reason; for there is no proportion nor no consequence between things, which have different natures and causes.

But let us hear how he proves this: *This Church, he says, must be an organized, or unorganized Body, made up of parts, Similares, &c.* Right! the Universal Church is unorganized as to the whole, though made up of organized parts. But this we must not say, for then we spoil his Argument; and yet he knows that every one, who denies an Universal Pastor set over the whole Church, must, and does, say it. So that the sum of his Argument is this: If you will allow the whole Church to be an organized Body, that is, to be under the Government of an Universal Pastor, then you must own an Universal Pastor; but if you will not own this, he has nothing to say to you, but that you ought in civility to own it, to make good his Argument. If men will be so perverse as to own particular National Churches to be Organized Bodies, and to deny the Universal Church to be thus Organized, (as we all do) then they may own a National Primate, and deny an Oecumenical Pastor; and if men own the Universal Church to be such an Organized Body, they must own an Universal Pastor, whether they own Archbishops and Primates or not; and therefore Archbishops and Primates might have been left out of this Argument, because they signify nothing in it; and consequently the whole Argument is nothing to his design, to prove that those who own Archbishops and Primates must own an Universal Pastor.

Well, but he undertakes for us, that we will not grant, that the Universal Church is an *unorganized Body*; because it lays a necessary Foundation, for particular Co-ordinate Churches,

*Churches, Congregational, or Presbyterian*: If he had said Episcopal, he had said right, and we know no inconvenience in this to say, that all Episcopal Churches are Co-ordinate, since all Bishops by an original Right are equal. But besides, if the Catholic Church be considered in its largest acception and extent, comprehending the Militant and Triumphant Parts, the Scripture tells us, it's an Organized Body, being called a Body of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the living Head. This is purely his own, for his Author had more Wit than to say it: The whole Church Militant and Triumphant, or the Church in Earth and Heaven, is but one Church, and this one Church is united to Christ, the Head of the Church, and this proves, that the Church on Earth cannot have any other Head, as the Principle of Unity, but only Christ: For the Head of the Church must be the Head of the whole Church, as the Head is the Head of the whole Body: And therefore the Church on Earth, being part of the Church, not the whole (for the Church in Heaven is the largest, and best part of the Body) it cannot have a visible Head on Earth, because such a Head cannot be the Head of the whole Body; for those who say the Bishop of Rome is the Head of the visible Militant Church on Earth, yet never pretended, that he is the Head of the invisible Triumphant Church in Heaven; now the Church on Earth can never have a Head, which is not the Head of the Church in Heaven, unless we will say, that part of a Body, as the Church on Earth is, may have a Head by it self, which is not Head to the other part of the Body, which is a thing, that never was heard of in the World before, that a Head should be Head only to part of the Body, and not to the whole, when the Body is but one.

But what does he mean, when he says, that the Church

Church Militant and Triumphant, is an Organized Body: What Organization is there in the Church Triumphant? They are all indeed united to Christ, and so are his Body, but there are no different organical Parts in this Body, no differing Ranks and Offices, that we know of, in the Church in Heaven, no distinction between Clergy and Laity, Prophets and Apostles, Pastors and Teachers there, for these Offices cease with the use of them, and therefore they are not united to Christ in one organical Body, which has different Members, and Offices, in Heaven; and therefore tho' the Church on Earth consists of such organized Bodies, yet it is not their Organization, which unites them to Christ, for then this would be necessary in Heaven, as well as in Earth, for the same one Body, and every part of it, must be united to Christ in the same manner, and by the same kind of Union; and if the Union of the Church on Earth does not consist in its Organization, to be sure, there is no necessity, that the whole Church on Earth should be one organized Body, to make it the Body of Christ. The Organization of particular Churches is for the Edification and good Government of all the Members of it, not immediately for their Union to Christ, and therefore if the whole Church may be edified, and well governed, by the Organization of particular Churches, the Church being called the Body of Christ, cannot prove, that the whole Church on Earth is, one organical Body.

But if particular Churches be organized, *it's most natural and fit, that the Mother Teeming Church, should have the most proportionate Adaptation of Parts. A Mother that brings forth organized Children, is supposed to be organized her self. Nihil dat quod non habet: Wherefore all other less comprehensive Churches, coming out of the Womb of Mother Church, and proved to be organized Bodies,*

*it's*



*it's naturally necessary, that she her self should be homogeneous, or of same kind, otherwise the Mother must be more monstrous than the Daughters.* Here he forsakes his Guide again, and falls into Nonsense. Could he find out a Mother Church, which is none of the Daughters, a Catholick Church, which is distinct from all Particulars, this would be a notable Argument indeed, to prove the Catholick Church to be organized, because particular Churches are; but if there be no Teeming Mother Church, but what is a particular Church it self, if no Church brings forth Churches, as a Woman brings forth her Daughters, nay if Churches are not brought forth, but Christians, who are afterwards formed into Church-Societies, if all this at best be nothing but Metaphor and Allusion, and that without any real likeness and similitude too, we may safely allow him such kind of Arguments as these, for his organized Catholick Church.

Well but now these particular Churches are transformed from *Daughters into integral Parts of the Mother Catholick Church*, nay, are Daughters and integral Parts too, which constitute the Mother; and then a *Body which is made up of Organized Parts, is always it self Organized, e. g. in all Animals, in a Man the head, hand, legs, &c. are each organized for the compleating the totality of that part; and therefore are becoming Organs to the whole man, and hence the man is an Organized Body.* Now indeed if the whole Church were such a Body as the natural Body of a Man is, and did consist of particular Churches, which did as much differ in their nature, and use, and organization, as the head, and hand, and legs, do in the natural Body; this were a very notable Argument to prove the whole Church to be an organized Body, consisting of particular Churches, as of integral Parts: But now the Apostle makes every particular Church to be such an organized Body.

Body, consisting of all the integral Parts of a Church, a Bishop, Presbyters, Deacons, and faithful People; and therefore particular Churches are not properly organized Parts of the Catholick Church, as the hands or legs are of a humane Body, which is made up of several other members of a different nature, but as organized wholes, every particular Church being a complete and entire Church, not a part of a Church; and the Catholick Church is considered as one, not so much by uniting all particular Churches, considered as particular Churches, which is to unite a great many wholes together, to make one whole, which is perfectly unintelligible; but by uniting the several parts, of which each particular Church consists, into one, they being the same in all; and this makes one organized Catholick Church, of the same nature and constitution, the same Officers and Members, with every particular organized Church. As for instance: A particular organized Church, as I have now observed, consists of a Bishop, Presbyters, Deacons, and faithful People, and the whole Catholick Church consists of the same Parts, and can have no other; and yet there are no Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Christian People to make up this Catholick Church, but what belong to some particular Churches, and yet particular Churches are not Parts of a Church, but compleat entire Churches, as having all the integral Parts, of a perfect Church, and therefore particular organiz'd Churches cannot make up a whole Church, as the several Parts make a whole Body, because they are each of them a whole; where then shall we find Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, People, to make up one Catholick Church? Now in this case there can be no other Notion of the Catholick Church, but the Union of the same Parts of all particular Churches into One, and then the Union of all these united Parts into one

one Body, makes the one Catholick Church. As to explain this briefly.

St. *Cyprian* tells us, that there is but one Episcopacy, or one Bishoprick, as I have already shown; and therefore all the Bishops, who are now dispersed over all the World, and have the Supream Government of their particular Churches, must be reckoned but one Bishop; for tho' their natural Persons are distinct, they are but one Ecclesiastical Person, their Office, Power, and Dignity, being one and the same, not divided into Parts, but exercised by all of them in their several Churches, with the same fulness and plenitude of Power; and thus we have found out one Bishop for the one Catholick Church, all the Bishops in the World being but one, for tho' they are many distinct Persons, they are but one Power, and exercise the same Office, without Division or Multiplication. And thus all the Presbyters in the World, who are under the Direction and Government of their several Bishops, are but one Presbytery of the Catholick Church, for if the Episcopacy be but one, the Presbytery must be but one also, in subordination to this one Episcopacy, the like may be said of Deacons, and of Christian People, that they are but one Body and Communion under one Bishop. Where there is but one Bishop, there can be but one Church, and therefore one Episcopacy unites all Christians into one Body and Communion: How this is consistant with the many Schisms and Divisions of the Christian Church, shall be accounted for else-where. This is a plain intelligible account, how all the particular Churches in the World are but one Church, because all the Parts and Members, which answer to each other in these particular Churches are but one by the Institution of Christ: All their Bishops but one Bishop, all their Presbyters but one Presbytery, all the Christians of particular

M

ticular Churches, but one Body and Communion; and thus the Catholick Church is an organized Body, consisting of the same parts, that all particular Churches consist of: Just as if Five Thousand Men, whose Bodies have all the same Members, should by coalition of corresponding Parts, grow up into one Body; that all their Heads, their Arms, their Legs, &c. should grow into one, which would make a kind of Universal organized Body, of the same nature with what every single individual Man has.

And that there can be no other Notion of the Catholick Church, as considered in this World, I think, is very plain from this, that there is but one Notion of a Church; and therefore the Catholick Church and particular Churches, must have the very same Nature and integral Parts. If a Bishop, Presbyters, and Christian People, make a particular Church, there must be the very same parts in the Catholick Church, or you must shew us two distinct Notions of a Church, and that the Catholick and particular Churches differ in their essential Constitution: If the Notion be the same, and all particular Churches constitute the Catholick Church, then these particular Churches must constitute the Catholick Church, just as they are constituted themselves, that is; of Bishops, Presbyters, and People; and therefore all the Bishops of particular Churches, must make but one Catholick Episcopacy, all the Presbyters, but one Presbytery, all the Christian People, but one Body and Communion; and then the Catholick Church, and particular Churches are exactly the same, one Body of Bishops, Presbyters, and People.

And this utterly destroys all subordination between Bishops, for if to the Notion of the Catholick Church, all Bishops must be considered as one, than every Bishop must

must be equal, for an inferior and superior Bishop cannot be one: And if the Notion of the Catholick Church did require one Supream Oecumenical Pastor, to whom all particular Bishops are subordinate, then the Catholick and particular Churches are not of the same Species, for the one has a sovereign, the other a subordinate Head, and therefore is not a compleat and perfect Church, nor of the same kind with the Church, which has the sovereign Head.

And thus I think, I might safely dismiss all our Author's Criticisms, about the several kinds of Totums, which he has transcribed from the Independent Copy, excepting some peculiar Absurdities of his own: For the Catholick Church properly speaking is no Totum at all, with respect to particular Churches, which are not properly Parts of the Catholick Church, considered as particular organized Churches, but the Catholick Church is one Church, by the Union of all the corresponding Parts of particular Churches, which we have no example of, that I know in Nature, nor is it to be expected to find the exemplars of such Mystical Unions in Nature, which depend not upon Nature, but upon Institution, but it may not be amiss briefly to shew our Author's great skill in such matters.

He takes it for granted, that the Church Catholick must be some kind of Totum or whole, and therefore undertakes to prove that in all Totums there must be a Subordination of parts, and therefore there must be a Supream Oecumenical Pastor in the Catholick Church. Now he says, *Totum is most legally* (I suppose it should be Logically) *divided into quatenus integrum, and quatenus genus*; such a whole as a Body is, which has all its parts, or such a whole as a Genus is to a Species; and one of these he thinks the Catholick Church must be: But then



his Author minded him, that there was an aggregate whole, such a whole as a heap of Corn is, but he told him also, that this was but a kind of Integrum; though if this Integrum signifies such a whole as has integrating Parts, the union of which makes the whole, such an Aggregate as has neither any parts nor any union, is a pretty kind of Integrum, but reduction may do great things, and therefore I won't dispute that: but since he has named this Aggregate whole, if any man should be so perverse as to say that the Catholick Church is such an aggregate Body, consisting of all particular co-ordinate Churches; what would become of his Subordination of Pastors; for what Subordination is there in aggregate Bodies, in those Grains suppose, which make up a heap of Corn, which are all alike? The Independent Author foresaw this Objection, but medles not with it, like a wise man who would not conjure up a Devil which he could not lay; but this Transcriber is bold and brave, and sometimes ventures out of his depth without his Bladders, and then he is usually ducked for it. He tells us, p. 70. That an aggregate whole has *integral parts*; which I believe is a new Notion; for I thought it had been a collection of incoherent things, which had no union nor relation to each other, as parts have to the whole: But how much he understands of this matter, appears from the example he gives, for he takes an Army to be such an aggregated whole; if he had said a Rout or a Rabble had been such an Aggregate, he had come near the business; but I fear the King's Guards will not take it well to be thought a meer aggregate Body: But he could find no other Aggregate, wherein there is a Subordination of parts, and therefore an Army must pass for such an Aggregate.

But let us consider his *Totum integrum*, which is a Natural

ral or Political whole, such as the Body of Man, or a Community is, which is made up of several parts, which are integral and essential to its composition. Now according to the right Notion of Subordination, the whole is divided into the next, but greater parts, and they into the next lesser, and they into lesser, or least of all. Well then, let us apply this to the Body of Man, which are the greater and lesser parts, and least of all into which it must be divided: Which are the Superiour, and which the Subordinate Parts in a Humane Body? There are some indeed which are higher, and others lower in the situation of the Body; some more noble and more useful than others; but there is no Subordination between them, that I know of, but the Soul governs them all, and they have the same care one of another. Indeed Subordination relates onely to governed Societies, which may be divided as he speaks into greater or less, superior or subordinate Parts; which is another kind of Integrum, such as we call a Community. But suppose this be what he means by his Integrum, not a Natural, but a Political whole; how does he prove that in every such Integrum, there must be such a Subordination of parts, as at last centers in one Supreme Governour? For what does he think of *Democracies*, or *Aristocracies*? Who is the Supreme where all are equal? And should any man say, that all the Bishops of the Catholick Church are equal, without any supreme Head over them, as *Democratical* or *Aristocratical* Princes are, how would he be able to confute him from his notion of Integrum? And therefore the meer notion of an Integrum will not prove such a Subordination of parts, as center in one supreme Head; but he must prove that the constitution of the *Christian* Church is such, as is under the Government of one supreme visible Head.

His.

His next Totum is *Genericum*. His Author had confessed that this does not belong to the Church; and he confesses it after him in the very same words: *This Notion I'll not further prosecute, because according to the best Logical and Theological Rules, the application of a Genus, doth not so well suit the nature of the Catholick Church, it being more properly an Integrum than a Genus.* And yet he would not lose this opportunity neither, to let us see his great skill in Logick: but since they both confess, it is nothing to the purpose, I shall not trouble my Readers with it.

Agreement,  
p. 61.  
Cath. Hicrar.  
p. 80, 81.

3. He argues from the nature of Subordination it self, of any kind, which always supposes a Supremum & infimum. And if there be in the Church a Subordination of Pastors, as our Protestant Prelates assert; then there must be a supreme as well as the lowest Term, viz. A Catholick Pastor for the highest range or round of the Ladder, and a Parish Priest, or (as our Bishops would have it if late) a Diocesan, for the lowest, the continuation being always to a neplus ultra at both ends of the Line. Which, for ought I see, does as well prove an Universal Monarch, as an Universal Pastor. For he tells us, this holds in any kind of Subordination. We do grant indeed, that there is a Subordination of Pastors in the Church, i. e. that Presbyters are Subordinate to Bishops; but we say with all Antiquity, that a Bishop, even a Diocesan Bishop, is not the lowest, but the highest Term; for a Bishop is the highest Order in the Church, and all Bishops are of equal Power, and this without any danger of Independency, as I have already shown.

4. His next Argument is from the derivation and original of Pastoral Office and Power. The Sum of which in short is this, that every Pastor must receive his Pastoral Power, from some Superior Pastor, that as Presbyters are ordina-

ed by Bishops; so Bishops by their Metropolitans, they by their Primare, and they by the Oecumenical Bishop, from whom they receive the Pastoral Staff. But he forgot all this while, from whom this Oecumenical Bishop must receive his Orders; and whether those who ordain the Pope, are his Superiors. Such Talk as this might become the Independent well enough, from whom he transcribes it, but is pretty Cant for a *Romanist*, for whoever has Authority to confer Orders, may certainly confer them, whether he be a Superior or Equal, and therefore he ought to have proved, that none but a Superior can have Authority to confer Orders; and then he must find a Superior to the Pope, to give him his Oecumenical Power. The Catholick Church has always owned the Power of Order to be in Bishops, who are the highest Order of the Church, and have a plenitude of Ecclesiastical Power, which is the reason why Presbyters cannot ordain without their Bishop, because they are not compleat Pastors, but act in subordination to, and dependance on their Bishops, and therefore have not such a fulness of Power in themselves, as to communicate it to others.

4. In the next place he argues from the chief ends of Subordination of Pastors in the Church, viz. That there may be place for Appeals in matters of Controversie, in Cases of Male-administration by the subordinate Clergy, final Determinations of difficult Ecclesiastical Causes, Correction of Heresy and Schism, as also establishment of Ceremonies. Schism and Ceremonies belong to the next head of Arguments, where his Author placed them, but this Transcriber has not Judgment enough to write after his Copy, but will sometimes venture to alter, tho' without sense. But there are as many choice passages in his pursuit of this Argument, as one could wish, which would make one suspect,

Agree. p. 74.  
Hierar. p. 83.

pect, that the Independent Author himself was a well-wisher to Popery, he disputes so heartily for a last Supreme Judge to receive Appeals, and for the Infallibility of such a Judge: But there is nothing more required to answer this Argument, but to give a plain state of this case of Appeals. We must distinguish then between Ecclesiastical Causes, and consider the original Right of Appeals.

As for Ecclesiastical Causes, nothing is a pure Ecclesiastical Cause, but what concerns the Communion of the Church, who shall be received into Communion, or cast out of it, or put under some less Censures, which confines this either to Faith or Manners: But as for other causes, which are called Ecclesiastical because they concern Ecclesiastical Things or Persons, such as the repairs of Churches, advancement of Livings, Tithes, Glebe, Oblations, &c. they are rather of a Civil than Ecclesiastical Cognizance, tho' Bishops and Ecclesiastical Persons are entrusted by the Civil Powers with the determination of them; and in such Matters as these, it is fit, there should lie Appeals, as there do in all other Civil Matters; but then, it is fit also, that these Appeals should be bounded as all other Civil Appeals are, within the Kingdom or Territory, where the cause arises; for to carry such Appeals out of the Kingdom, is as great an injury to the Authority of the Prince, as to the Liberties of the Subject. A Sovereign Prince has all civil Power and Jurisdiction, and to suffer Appeals to Foreign Bishops or Princes, is to own a Superior in his own Dominions; and therefore in such matters as these, no Appeal can lie to an Oecumenick Bishop.

As for causes purely Ecclesiastical, the Bishop being Supreme in his own Diocese, there can be no original Right of Appeal from him, for there is no Appeal from the Supreme: he has a free power in the Government of his

own



own Diocess, and must render an account of his actions to Christ, who is the supreme Lord of the Church, as St. Cyprian tells us. But, as notwithstanding this, it is very expedient, and in some degree necessary, that neighbour Bishops should unite into an Ecclesiastical Body for the maintainance of Catholick Communion, and the exercise of Discipline, as I have already shewn; so the very nature of such combinations admits and requires Appeals, that if any Presbyter or private Christian be too severely censured by his Bishop, or without just cause, he may find relief from the Synod or Primate, or in whomsoever the power of receiving Appeals is placed: for Bishops are men, and liable to humane Passions and frailties, and it would be impossible to maintain the Authority of Church censures, without such Appeals. For though there be no original right of Appeals from the Sentence of one Bishop to another; yet every Bishop has authority to receive whom he judges fit, into the Communion of his own Church; and should one Bishop depose a Presbyter, or Excommunicate a lay Christian unjustly, should they go into another Diocess, if the Bishop of it judged them worthy of Communion, he might receive them into Communion notwithstanding these censures; for he is Judge in his own Church, as the other was in his. But how contemptible would Ecclesiastical Censures be, if they reached no farther than single Diocesses; and what dissensions would this create among Bishops, should one receive those into Communion, whom the other had cast out? Which makes it highly expedient, that neighbour Bishops should be made, not the Judges of their fellow Bishops, or their actions, as it is in superiour Courts, which have a direct Authority over the inferiour, but Umpires and Arbitrators of such differences as may happen between the Bishop and his Clergy, or People; which will

preserve the peace and concord of Bishops, and give a more sacred Authority to Ecclesiastical Censures. But then these Appeals must be confined to this Ecclesiastical Body, and not carried to foreign Churches; for by the same reason that these Ecclesiastical Bodies and Communion must be confined within such limits as admit of such combinations, of which I have given an account above; these Appeals also must be confined to the Ecclesiastical Bodies, as St. Cyprian expressly affirms, that the Cause should be heard there where the Crime was committed.

Cyp. Ep. 55.  
ad Cornelium.

Thus we see there is no need of an Oecumenical Pastor to receive Appeals, much less of an Infallible Judge for this purpose; and thus I might dismiss this Argument, were it possible to pass it over without observing some peculiar strains of Reason and Rhetorick in it. As for Example: *That Appeals are to no end, if there be not some Supreme Catholic Pastor to arrive at, in whose determination we are bound to see down and rest satisfied.* As if there could be no last Appeal but to a Catholic Pastor, or no man were bound to rest satisfied in any other last Appeal. But I perceive the satisfaction he means, is the satisfaction of having our Cause determined by an Infallible Judge, who cannot Err. Which it may be, is the first time a Roman Catholic, for I must except his Independent Original, ever made the Pope an Infallible Judge not only in matters of Faith, but of all Causes, which are brought before him by Appeals.

But why may not the last Appeal be made to any one else, as well as to the Catholic Pastor? No: *the mind of the whole Catholic Church may be had in the Principium unitatis*; but no other National, Provincial, or Diocesan Pastor *haver the mind of the whole Catholic Church*: Which I can make nothing more of, but that the mind of the Catho-

*some Protestant Principles, &c.*

Catholick Pastor is the mind of the Catholick Church; and therefore the Catholick Pastor, if he speaks his own mind, speaks the mind of the Catholick Church too. He is the Head, and if we will know a mans mind we must resort to the Head, not to the Arms or Legs, where you can only expect a dumb kick on the Box under the Ear, as we have had enough of from our Protestant Prelates. — A Diocesan, Provincial, or Primate, are but the Churches more fairly and less intelligible Organs; (but Arms or Legs, which give dumb kicks, or boxes on the Ear) but if you will understand the sense of the Church, you must resort to the Body speaking in the Head, not to the kicking Heels. This is all demonstration, besides the advantages of apt figures, and the elegancies of expression to set it off.

Well, the last Appeals then must lie to the Catholick Pastor, because he knows the mind of the whole Church, and is its speaking Head; whereas Metropolitans and Primates are but dumb, silly, less intelligible Organs, whose mind you can only understand by kicks, or boxes under the Ear; which yet I think, is a very intelligible way, though I believe few People love to understand that way. For this reason then, we must go to the Head, that we may understand the mind of the whole Church, for then we cannot Err. But is this Head then Infallible? Yes, most certainly! for the pretensions made by the Catholick Pastor to Infallibility, are founded on the Principles of the Episcopal Constitution. For an Episcopal Church (settled by Subordination of Pastors within it self) without a Catholick Head, is an Animal without a Head. Which is a pretty strange sort of Creature. In all our Appeals from Pastor to Pastor, from Church to Church, in any Causes or Controversies, if we do not still come to a less Fallible Church, and at last arrive at the most Infallible, comprehensive of our selves as Members, Qui bono hic labor, & hoc

opus? That is, to what purpose do we Appeal from one Fallible Church to another, unless we can at last lodge our final Appeal in an Infallible Church? So that the reason why we must Appeal to the Catholick Pastor, is that our Cause may be determined by an Infallible Judge, who has the mind of the whole Church: and the proof of the Infallibility of this Catholick Pastor is, that to him must be made the last Appeals, which were to no purpose, if he were not the most Infallible. Thus Infallibility proves the necessity of Appeals, and Appeals prove the necessity of Infallibility; for one good turn requires another.

But still me-thinks there is a little difficulty, why there should be any Appeals at all to a Fallible Judge? Why should not all Causes in the first instance be brought before the Infallible Judge? Why must we take such a round by Bishops, Provincials, Metropolitans, Primates, before we come to the Catholick Pastor; when there can be no satisfaction till we come to the Infallible Judge, and have the mind of the whole Church from him? And as our Author observes, *Cui bono*, do men Appeal from one Fallible Creature to another? If the right of Appeals be grounded on Infallibility, why must we Appeal to those who are Fallible?

To save this, which is a real difficulty; our Author would insinuate (for he is afraid downright to own such an Absurdity) that there are *Degrees of Infallibility*, which if admitted we must arise to the highest, but why not go to the highest at first, but rise by Degrees? If it be granted that a Bishop is less fallible than a Parish Priest, and an Archbishop less fallible than a Bishop, and a Primate than he, upon the same ground we may expect the Catholick Pastor to be less fallible than all the rest. But what a lamentable ground is this for Infallibility! and what a lamentable Infalli-

fallibility is that, which is only being less fallible, than some other fallible Creatures?

But the pleasantest conceit is, that mens Infallibility encreases with their several Orders, and Degrees in the Church, that a Bishop is less fallible, and therefore more infallible than a Priest, and an Archbishop than a Bishop, &c. Now I suppose he will grant, that Infallibility does not result from mens personal Abilities, but is a supernatural Gift, and that Christ never gives any thing less, in such a supernatural way, than absolute Infallibility: And therefore, whatever Infallibility men can challenge, by vertue of a Promise, must be absolute, and absolute Infallibility has no degrees: If then the Infallibility of the Catholick Pastor be founded on a divine Promise, it has no relation at all to the several degrees of Fallibility in other Church Officers; unless he can show, where Christ has promised several degrees of Infallibility, to the several Orders and Degrees of Ecclesiastical Ministers, and then indeed we may conclude, that he has bestowed the most perfect Infallibility upon the Catholick Pastor, if it be first proved, that he has instituted such a Catholick Pastor. But it is evident, that to be more or less fallible, depends upon mens personal Abilities, Learning, Wisdom, Honesty, and therefore it is a ridiculous thing to say, that every Bishop must be less fallible than a Presbyter, and an Archbishop less fallible than a Bishop, and a Primate than he, unless you can prove, that all Bishops must be wiser, honest, and more learned men, than Presbyters, and Archbishops than Bishops, and Popes than Archbishops and Primates: Which I believe is a pretty hard Task, and yet our wise Author at last resolves the Popes Infallibility into this belief, *for it is not to be supposed, that the Catholick Church would commit the greatest Charge to a Person of the least Judgment and Understanding.*

So



So that it seems Infallibility at last is dwindled away into Mens personal Judgment and Understanding; and tho' it may be the Catholick Church might be careful in such a choice, yet we can easily suppose, that Cardinals, who may not be Men of the best Judgments themselves, and may be divided by Interests and Factions, or brib'd with Money, or over-awed by Power, or influenced by Friendships, may not always choose the wisest Man in the World, and if they did, yet he could be no more infallible this way, than the wisest Man in the World is, who after all is a fallible Creature, as all Men are: and I dare appeal to all sober and considering *Roman* Catholicks, whether our Author has not utterly overthrown the Infallibility of the Pope, and all Appeals to him, by what he adds. *To what purpose is it for us to betake our selves for further light to those, whom the Church has entrusted with higher Power and larger trust, if we have no reason to judge them, not only to be holier, wiser, and juster men, than those we appeal from, but less fallible in judgment, and errable in practice?* For I am confident few *Roman* Catholicks think their Popes to be the wisest and best Men in the World, and therefore if their inerrability depends upon their Wisdom and Honesty, they cannot think them Infallible neither, and I suspect our Author has no great claim to Infallibility himself, who at this time of day, when the Stories of Popes are so well known, should found Infallibility upon the Wisdom, Holiness, and Justice, of Popes.

By this one would guess, that he makes no great matter of the Popes Infallibility: that he has found out such a fallible Foundation for it. He says, *that the Oecumenic Pastor in his human Capacity may mistake and Err, and so did St. Peter, but not fundamentally, yet as Supreme Head in his Catholick Capacity, (quatenus in Cathedra Catholica,*

*& comparativa*) to all inferior subordinate Pastors, he hath a kind of Infallibility, which is a Power intrusted in him by the Catholick Church, to pass a final Judgment, of Determination in all Causes and Controversies, to be a *Ne plus ultra* to all Appeals and Litigations in the Church. So that in the first place he is not infallible in his human Capacity, and yet he founds his Infallibility on his Wisdom, Holiness, and Justice, which are human and personal Perfections. In his publick Capacity he would have him Infallible in the Chair, but yet it is but a comparative Infallibility, which is none at all. Then his Infallibility is not an Infallibility in judging, but a Power to make a final Determination, whether it be right or wrong, and any Man might have this Power, as well as the Pope, especially since he is not entrusted with this Power by Christ, but by the Catholick Church, that is too, only by the Church of Rome, for no other Church entrusts him with it, and thus he quits all Divine Claims to Infallibility, and the Pope is no more Infallible, than the Church can make him, by entrusting him with a final decision of Controversies, at all Adventures. And therefore he adds, *We are not bound to believe his Judgment infallibly true, but are to subscribe to it, as the last, because we can have no further, and higher Appeal on Earth.* That is, we must subscribe to it, whether we believe it true or not, which is an admirable sort of Infallibility. Thus he says, *the English Clergy Subscribe the 39. Articles, not that they believe them (as they commonly say) to be true, and Orthodox, but because they be the last Resolutions of the Church of England, in those Points, they sit down satisfied to subscribe them as Instrumenta pacis & unitatis, but indeed Maxime emolumentis, by which what he means, cannot guess, but am very much of his Mind, that upon the same ground, (were there no other reason of Subscriptions)*

*scriptions*) they may subscribe to the Council of Trent. But this is a Scandal on the Clergy of the Church of England; we subscribe to the Truth of the Doctrines, and for my part I would not subscribe, did I not think them true; and this is false with reference to the Church of Rome, which Anathematizes all Persons who do not own, and acknowledge, and believe, all the Articles of the Council of Trent: However Infallibility is at a low ebb in the Church of Rome, when they can exact Submissions and Subscriptions onely upon Protestant Principles, who pretend to no Infallibility at all: I have examined this Argument a little more at large, to make him sensible how dangerous a thing it is to write after an Independent Copy: for had any man intended to have burlesqued Infallibility, (as possibly his Author, from whom he Transcribes, did) he could not have done it more effectually, than by such Principles as these.

*Agreem. p. 77.  
&c. Cath. Hier.  
p. 85, &c.*

6. His sixth Argument (in *Catholic Hierarchy* the seventh, for he has dropt one from the Nature of the Church, which he made an Introduction of, and there it has been considered) is, *that this Catholic Headship is inseparable from an Ecclesiastical Body, made up of subordinate Pastors and Churches, may be abundantly evidenced from these following enumerated Church necessities:*

*The necessity, 1. Of a Catholic judgment of Schism. 2. Of a Catholic interpretation of Scriptures. 3. Of a Catholic determination of Ceremonies, for order and decency. 4. For a Catholic compofure of Forms of Prayer. 5. For a Catholic Canonization of Saints. 6. A Catholic Call and Convention of Councils Oecumenic. Which are Word for Word the Argument of the Independent Author. I shall briefly consider them all.*

*1. The necessity of a Catholic judgment of Schism. i. e. that there should be some Judges who are Schismatics, for*

For otherwise, 1. Patriarchal or National Churches may be Schismatical and no competent remedy found for the said Schism. 2. There can be no determination of a Schism from the Catholick Church, nor any proportionate punishment of it: For a Patriarch or National Primate cannot be judicially proceeded against, but by an Oecumenic Pastor; which I think is the same with the first: for a National Schism must be a Schism from the Catholick Church, or none; since National Churches among us, depend on no foreign Patriarchs. 3. Because superiour Churches are to judge the inferiour; no particular Church has an absolute definitive Power in it self, but there lies an Appeal against it to the Catholick Church and Pastor. Which instead of proving, that there is such a Catholick Pastor, supposes that there is one; for else there can lie no Appeal to him. 4. That particular Churches will never agree about Schism, but the very disputes about Schism, will make Schisms without end. Now, suppose a man should turn the Tables, and prove by this Argument, that there is no Catholick Pastor, nor Catholick Judge of Schism; because there are, and always have been Schisms in the Christian Church, which it is impossible there should be, did the Church know of such a Catholic Judge: For how could there be any such dispute about Schism, if there were such a Judge? If you say, that it is the not owning such a Judge, which makes the Schisms: That may be true, but it is true also, that it is a sign the Christian World does not know of any such Judge; for if they did, they would own him, and put an end to their Schisms: If it be necessary, there should be such a Catholick Judge of Schism, I am sure it is necessary he should be known, or else, as Experience testifies, the disputes about such a Judge, will make more Schisms than such an unknown and disputable Judge can ever end.



Now since there either is no such Catholick Judge of Schism, or he is not sufficiently known to all Christians, methinks it proves, that there is no need of such a Catholick Judge of Schism; for there is as much need he should be known, in order to put an end to Schisms, as that there should be such a Judge; and if the necessity of ending Schisms proves, that there should be such a Judge, I am sure the continuance of Schism proves as plainly, that he is not known, because he cannot end them. It is ridiculous to imagine, that there should be any such thing as Schism, were there a known Oecumenical Pastor and Judge; and it is as ridiculous to prove that there is such a Judge, from the necessity of such a Judge to end Schisms, when it is demonstrable from the continuance of these Schisms, that the Christian World knows of no such Judge. And it is very strange, that Christ should appoint such a Judge, and not take care that he should be known. Good Arguments must convince Schismatics in this World; and Christ will judge them in the next, and I know of no other Catholick Judgment of Schism.

Agriem. p. 80.  
Cath. Hist. p.  
89.

2. From the necessity of a Catholick Resolution of difficult and dubious places of Scripture. For the Scripture is not of private Interpretation; and there are great inconveniences in leaving Scripture to the Interpretation of private men, or particular, though National Churches. But let the inconveniences be what they will, the same Argument returns again, that if there be such an infallible Interpreter of Scripture, he ought to be known; and that there are such disputes about the Interpretation of Scripture, proves, that the Christian World do not own such a Catholick Interpreter, and therefore that they know nothing of him. And there is another Argument, that there is no such Catholick Interpreter of Scripture, because we have no such Catholick Interpretation:



tion: And what is the Christian World the better for a Catholick Interpreter, if he does not Interpret? And yet in the Church of *Rome* it self, we have no Expositions of Scripture, but from private and fallible men: The truth is, the Pope and his Councils have Expounded plain Scriptures to a dubious, difficult, unintelligible sence, but never, that I know of, made any Text easie and intelligible, which was difficult before. To expound Scripture, is to make us understand it, not to impose upon our Faith without understanding; and therefore this is not so much an act of Authority, as of skill and judgment; any man, who can so explain Scripture to me, as to make me understand it, shall gain my assent, but no Authority is sufficient to make me assent without understanding. And yet such a Catholick Expositor our Author would set up, whose Authority shall make me grant that to be the sence of Scripture, which his Reasons and Arguments cannot perswade me of. But all reasonable Creatures must understand for themselves; and Christ no where commands us to believe that to be the sence of Scripture, which we cannot understand to be so. I know no necessity that all Christians should agree in the Interpretation of all difficult Texts of Scripture: there is enough in Scripture plain, to carry men to Heaven, and as for more difficult and obscure Texts, they are for the improvement of those who can understand them, and need no such Catholick Expositor, because it is not necessary that all men should understand them. Most of the Controversies of Religion, especially between us and the Church of *Rome*, are about Texts of Scripture, easie enough to be understood, and an honest teachable mind, would sooner end our Controversies, than his Catholick Expositor.

3. Another necessity for an Oecumenic Pastor, is, *Agrum. p. 81. Cath. Hist. p. 87.*  
necessity of a Catholick Determination of Decency and Order:

*der: i. e.* That the same Rites and Ceremonies, for decency and order, should be observed in all Christian Churches all the World over. Now I know no necessity of this; and that which is not necessary it self, cannot make an Oecumenic Pastor necessary. *De facto*, there have been diversity of Rites in the Christian Church in all Ages; thus it was in St. *Augustine's* time, as appears from his Epistle to *Januarius* 118; and then either there was no Catholick Pastor, or he did not think such a Catholick Uniformity of Rites necessary. None of the Fathers ever condemn such a diversity as this, but exhort all Christians to conform to the innocent Customs and Ceremonies of the Church, where they came, though different from the Customs of their own Church; which St. *Augustine* tells us in that Epistle, was the Advice of St. *Ambrose*. And when Pope *Victor* Excommunicated the *African* Churches for their different Custom in observing *Easter*, *Irenaeus*, and other Bishops, did vehemently oppose him in it; and therefore, either did not believe him to be the Catholick Pastor, or did not think, that the Catholick Pastor ought to impose an Uniformity of Rites upon all Churches. The Decency of Worship is nothing else, but to perform the external acts of Worship in such a manner, as may express our Reverence and Devotion for God: And therefore, since there are no Catholick signs of Decency, there can be no Catholick Uniformity in these matters. The decency of Garments, Postures, Gestures, differ in several Countries; and so do the Expressions of Honour and Reverence: And therefore such external Rites being onely for external Decency, and having no Sacredness by Institution, may vary with the different Customs and Usages of Countries: We must Worship God in a decent manner; this all Christian Churches are bound to, and this they do, when they Worship God in such

such a manner as among them signifies Reverence and Honour. But says our Author, *then one Church will esteem this or that thing decent in the Worship of God, which another reckons absurd.* Then say I, they are as absurd as Country People are, who gaze at Foreigners, and laugh at their exotick Habits, and think every thing ridiculous, which differs from their own Customs. But *this Uniformity is lost in the Catholick Church, where it is most necessary to be had.* An Uniformity in external Rites is not necessary in the Catholick Church, and it may be cannot be had.

But why is it necessary there should be uniformity then in particular National or Diocesan Churches? *Ans.* Because it is fit and decent, that those who Worship God in the same Assemblies, should Worship him in the same manner, and to do otherwise would contradict the public decency of the Worship. Every Bishop (as being the Supreme Governour of his own Church and Diocels) has Authority to appoint the decent Rites of Worship in it; and when all the Bishops of a Nation are united into one National Body, they may consent in some common Rites of Worship for the National Church, since the Usages and Customs of the same Nation, the Rules of Decency, and the expressions of Honour and Reverence, are the same, which gives an account, what Churches have this Power to determine the Decencies and Order in Ceremonies; every Bishop has an original Right to do this for his own Church, but as a National Combination of Bishops, to govern their several Churches by a mutual Consent, is of great use, so when they are united into a National Body, it is much more decent, that they should agree upon an Uniformity of Rites for the National Church; but there is not the same reason, that this should extend to Foreign Churches, much less to the whole

whole World, both because these Combinations of Bishops are limited to National Churches, and the Customs of different Countries change and vary.

Agrim. p. 84.  
Cath. Hier. p.  
89.

4ly. The necessity of a Catholick Canonization of Saints, for supposing a necessity of a due Observation of Saints Days, which the Church of England hath always insisted on and pleaded for, it is to be enquired, who or what Church Canonized the Saints, &c. The Church of England indeed does observe some Festivals, in commemoration of the Saints, but she needs no Oecumenick Pastor to Canonize them: She observes the Festivals of no Saints, but such as the Christian World acknowledge to be so, without the Popes Canonization: and the title she makes of Saints, needs no Canonization, which is only to bless God for them, and to excite our selves to an imitation of their Vertues: not to build Temples and Altars to them, or to Worship them with religious Honours as our Mediators and Advocates. This Canonization of Saints was a strange kind of Argument, from a pretended Independent, and it is such an Argument, as I thought at this time of day, a Romanist himself would have been ashamed of: For pray, what Authority has the Church to Canonize Saints, and who gave her this Authority? Such Consecrations and Canonizations, indeed were in practice in Pagan Rome, and Tertullian sufficiently scorns them for it. He tells us, that there was an ancient Decree, that the Emperor should not Consecrate any God, without the approbation of the Senate, for the Emperor in those days was the Pontifex Maximus, or the Oecumenick Priest. This the Father says was to make Divinity depend upon human Votes; and unless the God pleases Men, he shall not be a God: how applicable

*Vetus erat deus, cuius deus ab Imperatore consecratur, nisi a Senatu probetur. Apud vos de humana arbitratu Divinitas, posuitur, nisi hominis Deo placeat. Deus non erit, homo jam non propter Deum deus est. Tert. Apol. p. 6. Paris, 1604.*

able



cable this is to the Canonization of Saints, let our Author judge, and tell me, whether there were any such practice known in the Christian Church, in Jerusalem's days To Canonize a Saint, is to be sure, is to Votè him into Heaven; and if the Oecumenick Pastor has this Authority, he is somewhat more than the Head of the visible Church on Earth, for his Power extends to the invisible Church too.

*ply. The necessity of a Catholick confession of Church* Agrim. p. 85.  
Roth. Hist. p. 22.  
*Prayers.* i. e. That the same Liturgie should be used in all Christian Churches; which never was practised in former Ages, and no need it should be; We prefer a Liturgie before private and ~~separate~~ Prayers; we think it most Uniform, that a National Church should use the same Liturgie; but if every Bishop, who is the Supreme Governour of his own Church, should have a Liturgie of his own, I see no hurt in it, if it be a true Christian Liturgie, and neither corrupt the Christian Faith, nor Worship. When he can give me one wise reason, why the whole Christian World must use the same Liturgie, and that there must of necessity be an Oecumenick Pastor to compose this Liturgie, I will consider it further. His harangue about our charging Dissenters with Schism, does not relate to this matter: For setting aside the Civil Authority, whereby our Liturgie is confirmed, their Schism does not consist in using another Liturgie, for they use none; but in separating from the Communion of their Bishop, who has Authority to appoint what Liturgie shall be used in his Church: For the Liturgie being agreed on in Convocation, makes it an Act of the Church, confirmed by the Authority and Consent of all the Bishops, besides the concurrent Votes and Suffrages of the inferior Clergy: And if every particular Bishop have Authority to appoint, what Form of Prayer shall be



be used in his Church, all the Bishops of England may agree in the same Liturgie; and those who deny obedience to their Bishops, and separate from them upon such a count, are guilty of Schism. But where there is no such subjection and obedience owing, as there is none between particular Bishops, and distinct National Churches, they may make Liturgies and Forms of Prayer for themselves, and are accountable to no Body else for it.

Agreem. p. 97.  
Cath. Hist. p. 92.

His last necessity for an Oecumenick Pastor, is, for calling, convening, and dissolving Oecumenical Councils. Now, if there be no such absolute necessity of Oecumenical Councils; if they may, and have been called by Emperors; if they may meet together of themselves, by Mutual Agreement, then there is no necessity of an Oecumenical Pastor for this purpose. But such an Assembly, he says, must be a Church Assembly, or else it can claim no Power in the Church, and all Church Assemblies are of right convened by the Pastor of the said Church, in which it is, as in a Diocese, the Clergy is convened by the Authoritative Call of the Bishop. This is the force of his whole Argument, wherein there are two things supposed, which we desire him to prove. 1. That an Oecumenical Council is not for Mutual Advice, but for direct Acts of Authority and Government. 2. That a Council receives its Authority from an Authoritative Call; when he has proved these two Propositions, his Argument may deserve a new Consideration.

Now, if we consider the Authority of a Bishop, who has Authority to appoint what Liturgie shall be used in his Church: For the Liturgie being agreed on in Convocation, makes it an Act of the Church, consented by the Authority and Consent of all the Clergy, besides the consent and suffrages of the inferior Clergy: And if every particular Bishop have Authority to appoint, what Form of Prayer shall

# ANSWER

## TO SECTION II.

### CONCERNING

*The Agreement between the Two Churches,  
about some of their Imposed Terms of  
Communion, their Ministry, Ceremonies,  
and Image-Worship.*

### I. The MINISTRY.

**H**AVING answered all their Pretences of Agreement, between the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, concerning one Supreme Oecumenical Pastor; what remains will give me no great trouble, and I shall give my self, and my Readers no more than needs must.

The first Agreement is about the *Ministry*, unto Agreem. p. 35. which all are required to submit, which is the same with that of Roman-Catholicks, and maintained by the same Arguments; that is, concerning the Divine Institution of Bishops and subject Presbyters. Now this charge we own, that we do acknowledge the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and that Presbyters by the Institution of their Office are subject to Bishops; and if the Roman-Catholicks own this,

this, we agree with them in it; and so we will in any thing else; that is true, and think it no injury to our cause; for we do not think our selves bound to renounce what is true, only that we may differ from Roman-Catholicks: and yet the mischief is, that in despite of his Title and design, he will not suffer us to agree with them here, but endeavour to prove, that we do not agree with them. Thus he tells us,

1. *Touching the difference there is between a Bishop and a Presbyter, as amongst the Papists some held, that they were of the same order, differing only in degree, and others that they were of distinct Orders; so among our Clergy* (I perceive our Author has a mind to be a Protestant at last, by his crying our Clergy) *there were some, who in King James the First days, asserted that Bishops and Presbyters were of the same Order, but now it is carried for their being of two distinct Orders; but what is this to the Agreement of the two Churches, that there are Divines in each Church, which differ about this Point? If neither Church have determined this, then they agree onely in not determining it; but if it were the Currant Doctrine in the Council of Basl, that Bishops and Priests are of the same Order, and it be the ayowed Doctrine of the Church of England, that Bishops are a distinct and superior Order; then I think the two Churches do not agree about this Point.*

And our Author himself takes care to prove, that we are not agreed: For the Romanists, he says, *do not so much stick to the Divine Right of the Episcopal Order, as to hold, that without a Violation of the Divine Law; a Presbyter cannot be intrusted with the Episcopal Insignia, and ordinary Jurisdiction; yet, its the ayowed Doctrine of the Church of England, that the giving the Power of Consecrating Orders to a Presbyter, is so contrary to the Divine Law, that its ipso facto, null and void; and in pursuance of this Doctrine,*  
*see*

she Re-ordains all those, who have had onely a Presbyter's Ordination, even whilst she is against a Re-ordination. And thus he has himself confuted his first Point. The Agreement of the two Churches about the Ministry, for a disagreement about the Power of Orders, is so concerning a Point in the Ministry, that there can be little agreement after it. This determines the Dispute that Bishops do not differ in Order, but onely in Degree from Presbyters; for if Bishops by a Divine or Apostolical Institution were a distinct and superior Order, Presbyters could never be intrusted with the ordinary Power and Jurisdiction of a Bishop, such as the Power of conferring Orders is; much less that a Presbyter should have Power to Consecrate Bishops, and Bishops should be subject to Presbyters, as he affirms of the *Abbot of Hy*: This overthrowes the Essential Constitution of the Ministry, if Bishops are by Institution a Superior Order to Presbyters, that Presbyters should have Authority to Consecrate and Govern Bishops; and overthrowes one of the principal Arguments for an Oecumenic Pastor, as it is urged by our other Author, from the power of conferring Orders which he says cannot be done, but by a superiour Pastor; and surely Presbyters, though sovereign Abbots, are not superiour Pastors to Bishops, nor to Presbyters neither.

And yet the Church of *England* does not deny, but that in case of necessity, the Ordinations of Presbyters may be valid; and upon this Principle justifies the Presbyterian Orders of Foreign Churches, while such unavoidable necessity lasts, as I have also done at large in the *Vindication*, to which this Author so often refers. But the case of *Schism* is a different thing, and I believe our Author himself, though he grants a Power to the Pope to entrust Presbyters with the power of conferring Orders, will not

say, that Schismatical Presbyters may take this Power, or that their Ordinations are valid, if they do. And this is the case between us and our Dissenters, they ordain in a Schism; and though necessity may make an irregular Act valid, yet Schism will not. And I would desire to know what reason it is for which they Null the Protestant Reformed Ministry; which, he says, is so much less severe than the Principles of the Church of England. The artifice of all this is visible enough, to heighten and inflame the difference at this time between the Church of England and Dissenters, but in vain is the Snare laid in the sight of any Bird.

But that the Reader may better understand the Mystery of all this, I shall briefly shew, why the Church of Rome is so favorable to that Opinion, that Bishops and Presbyters are of the same Order, and differ onely in degree: why they allow the Ordinations of Abbots Sovereign; who are but Presbyters, to be both valid and regular; that they are exempted from the Jurisdiction of the Diocesan; and have in themselves Episcopal Authority, whereby they can Ordain, Correct, Suspend, Excommunicate, and Absolve; nay, exercise this Jurisdiction over Bishops themselves, as this Author tells us of the Abbot of Hy. Which will shew, how far we are from agreeing with the Church of Rome about Episcopal Power.

The plain Account of which in short is this: That they distinguish their Orders in the Church of Rome, with relation to the Sacrament of the Eucharist: and since the Doctrine of Transubstantiation prevailed; which is such a wonderful Mystery, for a Priest to Transubstantiate the Elements into the Natural Flesh and Blood of Christ; this is looked upon as the highest act of Power in the Christian Church, and therefore that must be the highest Order, which has the highest Power: and since a mere Priest



Priest has this power of Consecration, which is as high an Act, as any Bishop can do: therefore they conclude, that Episcopacy is not an higher Order than the Priesthood, but differs onely in Degrees with respect to the power of Jurisdiction.

And the competition between Popes and Bishops, to serve their several Interests, did mightily incline them to favour this Opinion. The Papal Monarchy could never arrive at its utmost greatness, without depressing and lessening the Authority of Bishops; and therefore aspiring Popes granted Exemptions, Dispensations and Delegations to Presbyters; that there was no part of the Episcopal Office, but what a Presbyter might do by Papal Delegations, which made Presbyters equal to Bishops; but advanced the Pope vastly above them.

When by these Arts, which were often complained of, the Pope's Power grew boundless, and infinite, and it was thought necessary to bring it lower; it could not be done without calling in the assistance of Presbyters, and allowing them to Vote in the Council: For the majority of Bishops were engaged by Interest and Dependence, to maintain the Papal Greatness; and therefore if these matters must have been determined by the major Votes of Bishops, there could be no remedy against the Papal Usurpations. For which reason, in the Council of *Basil*, those Bishops, who were devoted to the Interest of the Pope, and knew they were able to secure the Cause, if none but Bishops might Vote, insisted on this, That according to the Presidents of former Councils, all matters might be determined onely by the Votes of Bishops; and now the equality of Order between Bishops and Presbyters, was trumped up to serve another turn; to prove their right to Vote in Councils; to assist those Bishops, who groaned under Papal Usurpations, in some measure

to.

to cast off that Yoke, and vindicate their own Liberties.

To this original the equality of Order between a Bishop and Presbyter, is chiefly owing in the Church of Rome; from this Authority the Abbots Sovereign derive their Power, which is a subversion of the Supream Authority of Bishops, has no president, and would never have been allowed, in the Primitive Church; and therefore as for the Dispute about the Abbot of *Ely*, what the matter of fact is (which those learned men, whom he assaults, I doubt not, are able to defend, were there a just occasion for it) is nothing to our purpose: If it were as he says, it is an intolerable encroachment upon the Episcopal Authority, and void in it self.

We who deny Transubstantiation, and disown any such Authority in the Pope, to delegate the Episcopal Power to meer Presbyters, do not, I suppose, very exactly agree with the Church of *Rome* in this matter.

2. Much at the same rate we agree in asserting the difference between a Bishop and Presbyter, to be of an immediate divine Right: This indeed we do constantly affirm, that the Institution of Episcopacy is by immediate divine Right, but is this the currant Doctrine in the Church of *Rome*? That he knew was false, and therefore had no sooner said it, but he unsays it again: For says he, "It's true, that those, who are for the divine Right of the "Supream Jurisdiction of the Pope, over the whole "Catholick Church visible, do hold the divine Right to be "but mediate (*mediante Papa*) but the Followers of the "Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, are against the Supream "uncontroulable Power of the Pope, and for the immediate divine Right of Episcopacy. And it's notorious from "the Debates in the Council of *Trent*, that the *French*, "*Spanish*, and many other *Roman-Catholicks* stuck to "their

"their immediate Divine Right too, and the great  
"reason, why opposition was made in the Court of  
"Rome, against the immediate divine Right of Bi-  
"shops, was an Opinion that the Supremacy of the  
"Pope could not be secured on the granting it. But Dr.  
"Sherlock has found out a Notion, which will be of great  
"use to them; for the divine Right of a Primacy is a  
"great step to the Supremacy; and this the Doctor doth  
"establish consistently enough with the divine Right of  
"Bishops.

As for my own Notion, I have sufficiently vindicated  
that already, from doing any Service to the Pope's Su-  
premacy, and see no occasion to add any thing more  
here: But I wonder he should pitch upon this instance of  
the divine right of Episcopacy, to show the Agreement  
between the two Churches, when he himself is forced to  
acknowledge, what fierce Debates there were in the  
Council of *Trent* about this matter: He says indeed, and  
that very truly, that the *French* and *Spanish* Bishops in  
the Council, did dispute very vehemently for the divine  
Institution of Episcopacy, and he knows what a prevail-  
ing opposition was made against it: The Pope sent ex-  
press Orders to the Legates, that whatever they did, they  
should not suffer that to pass; *Laynez* the Jesuit was ap-  
pointed by the Legates, and *Papalins*, to make an elabo-  
rate Lecture against it. Wherein he asserts, that Christ  
built his Church upon *Peter*, whose Name signifies a  
Stone in the *Hebrew* and *Syriack*, and therefore accord-  
ing to the most Catholick exposition, *Peter* himself is  
that Rock, whereon Christ built his Church, that the  
Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, were given to *Peter*-  
only, and by consequence, Power to bring in, and to shut  
out, which is Jurisdiction: So that the whole Jurisdiction of  
the Church, is committed to *Peter* only and his Successors.

And

*Faithful Paul's  
History of the  
Council of  
Trent, B. 7.  
P. 570. &c.*

And if the Bishops had received any Jurisdiction from Christ, it would be equal in all, and no difference between Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops; neither could the Pope meddle with that Authority, to diminish, or take it all away, as he cannot do in the Power of Order, which is from God. That to make the Institution of Bishops, *de jure divino*, takes away the Hierarchy, and introduces an Oligarchy, or rather an Anarchy. That according to the Order Instituted by Christ, the Apostles were ordained Bishops, not by Christ, but by *St Peter*, receiving Jurisdiction from him only; or if they were ordained by Christ, Christ only prevented *St. Peter's* Office for that one time. That the Bishops are Ordinaries, because by the Pope's Law, they are made a Dignity of perpetual Succession in the Church. That Councils themselves had no Authority but from the Pope; for if every particular Bishop in Council may Err, it cannot be denied, that they may all Err together, and if the Authority of the Council, proceeded from the Authority of Bishops, it could never be called General; because the number of the Assistants is always incomparably less than that of the Absent. With much more to this purpose, which is all full and home to the point, which as the Bishop of *Paris* observed in his Censure of it, makes but one Bishop Instituted by Christ, and the others not to have any Authority but dependant from him, which is as much as to say, that there is but one Bishop, and the others are his Vicars, to be removed at his pleasure.

Whatever Opposition was made against this in the Council of *Trent*, it could never prevail: The Popes Supremacy was advanced in that Council to its greatest height and glory, but the Divine Institution of Episcopacy was dropt, though the whole Council was satisfied, that the Divine Right of Supremacy, and the Divine Institution

tution of Episcopacy were inconsistent : For this Reason, the Pope and Legates, and *Italian* Bishops opposed the Divine Institution of the Episcopacy, and for the same Reason the other Party so vehemently contended for it; and then I will leave any man to judge, which of these two Opinions must pass for the Sense of the Council and Church of *Rome* : We wish with all our Hearts, the Church of *Rome* did agree with us in the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, which was the Sense of the Primitive Church; but unless all Parties in the Council of *Trent* were very much mistaken, the Supremacy of the Pope, as it is Taught by that Council, does utterly overthrow the Divine Institution of Bishops, and make them only the Pope's Creatures and Dependents.

3. As for his third Head of Agreement about the *Hierarchy*, which is made up of Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Prebends, Canons, Arch-Deacons, Chancellors, Officials, Priests, Deacons, &c. This is only an Ecclesiastical Body of human Institution, for the good Government and Discipline of such Combined Churches; and alterable again, as the necessities of the Church requires; and yet, there is an Essential Difference between such Protestant National Combinations of Churches, and the Popish Hierarchy; The first is Independent on any Foreign Powers, is perfect and entire in it self; The second has an Oecumenick Pastor for it's Head, and derives its Power and Authority from him; and this is enough to be said about our Agreement in the *Ministry*.

Q

The



## II. *The CEREMONIES,* OR EXTERNAL WORSHIP.

*Aggus. p. 47.*

**T**HIS is the next instance of Agreement between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*, and any man, who considers the matter, must needs be very much surprized at it. For if the two Churches were so very well agreed about Ceremonies, it is very strange that the Church of *England*, from the beginning of the Reformation, to this day, has rejected such a vast number of Ceremonies, as were then, and still are, in use in the Church of *Rome*. And for my part, it is my desire and prayer, that they may always agree so, while the Church of *Rome* maintains and practices such a corrupt Worship.

To make this out, he says, Our first Reformers opposed the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*, upon the same Principles that our Dissenters now oppose the Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, viz. by this Argument,

*All Uninstituted Worship is False, Superstitious, and Idolatrous Worship.*

*But the Romish Ceremonious Worship, is Uninstituted.*  
Ergo!

And if our Author can shew me any such Argument urged

urged by our first Reformers against Ceremonies, that are merely for Decency, and Order, and external Solemnity of Worship, I will grant, they argued very ill, and did much worse to retain any such Ceremonies. But if he cannot shew this, as I am sure he can't, then the Reader knows what to judge of him and his Argument too.

As for the Controversie between the Church of *England* and Dissenters about the use of Ceremonies in Religion, it is nothing to our present Dispute; and though our Author has a mind to revive these Disputes among us, he shall not draw me into it: It is sufficient we dispute against them, and against the Church of *Rome*, upon very different Principles. Against them we defend the lawful use of indifferent Rites and Ceremonies in Religious Worship, though there be no express command for it in the Word of God, if they serve the ends of Order and Decency, which are expressly commanded. Against the Romanists we never object, that their Ceremonies have no Divine Institution, that they are not commanded, but either, that they are forbid, or that they are so numerous, that they are very burdensome, or that they are abused to superstitious purposes, or that the signification of them is so dark and obscure, that they are of no use in Religion. Which is best expressed in the words of our Church, *Concerning Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained.*

*Of such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the Institution of man: (and therefore our Church, from the beginning, never quarrel'd with Ceremonies, because they had not a Divine Institution) Some at first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition; some entered into the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were wink-*

ed at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which, not only for their unprofitableness, but because they have much blinded the People, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected: *under these be, which although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent Order in the Church, (for the which they were first devised) as because they pertain to Edification, whereunto all things done in the Church, (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred.* With a great deal more to the same purpose, which every body may see, who will turn to the beginning of his *Common Prayer-Book*.

And yet I deny not, but our first Reformers might, as we do at this day, condemn all *Uninstituted Worship*, and condemn several practices of the Church of *Rome* under that Notion, such as Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images, &c. but they never took her Ceremonies to be any acts, or parts of Worship, but only some Adjuncts and external Circumstances for the decent and orderly Performance of Religious Worship. And to say, as this *Author* does, that the *Dissenters* did at last prove, to the conviction of the Church of England Clergy, that the *controversied Ceremonies* were parts of external Worship; and that we were forced to fall in with the *Roman Catholick* in denying, that *Uninstituted Worship* is *False, Superstitious, and Idolatrous*: to speak so is not true. The *Dissenters* themselves never thought that external Circumstances were parts of Worship, but endeavoured to prove, that our Ceremonies were not meet Circumstances of Worship, but Sacraments: but I never heard of any Divine of the Church of England, that allowed them to be so, or that thought they had proved it.

What the sense of the present Clergy is, may be learned, as from a great many other excellent Books, so especially

(specially from *The Case of indifferent Things*, and *The Church of England's Symbolizing with the Church of Rome*: Which are in the Collection of Cases, lately Written for the satisfaction of Dissenters, when the Government thought fit for other reasons, to require a vigorous execution of those Laws against them, which had lain Dormant for some time: To show the World at that time, what persecuting Spirits they were of, they used their utmost diligence, both by private Conferences, and publick Writings, managed with all the softness and tenderness, that any Dispute is capable of, to satisfy their Scruples, and thereby to prevent their Sufferings, which could be prevented no other way: and let our Author try his skill, if he pleases, to find out In those Cases, such an Agreement, as he pretends, between the Church of England, and the Church of Rome, which I believe he may as soon do, as find out that persecuting Spirit in them, he so much talks of, unless good Arguments and soft Words, may pass for a Persecution.

But Dr. Covel he says, calls Ceremonies the external Act of Religion: I grant he does so, and I think it a very loose definition of a Ceremony: But then we must consider, that he plainly enough tells us, what kind of Acts of Religion our Ceremonies are, that they are *only* to make the Act of Devotion to be more Solemn, and that Solemnity is in some measure a necessary adjunct to all publick Service. And if Solemnity be but an Adjunct, and Ceremonies but for Solemnity, they cannot be in a strict Notion Acts of Religion, but Adjuncts of publick Worship. And as he calls them, *The Hedges of Devotion*, and tho' not the principal Points, yet as some of the Fathers call them, the Second intention of the Law, intermediate means not to be despised, of a better and more religious Service. Which plainly enough shews, what distinction

Covel's modest Examination, p. 6. p. 55.



he made between Ceremonies strictly so called, and Acts of Worship.

Ibid. p. 56.

And therefore he tells us, that there are *Three Acts of Religion*, 1. *The Internal*, which is the willing desire, to give unto God his due Worship and Honour. 2. *The External Answering to this*, which is no otherwise good or commendable, than that it vertuously serveth to this end. 3. *The commanded Act*, that is the Act of every Vertue ordained by Religion to God's Honour. The Second, which is the external Act, and includes the whole external Worship, he calls Ceremonies, not as Ceremony now signifies, among us, the external Decencies and Solemnities of Worship, but as it was anciently used to signify all external Worship. And therefore he afterwards distinguishes between these Ceremonies. That, 1. *Some were for Justification*, such as the Law commanded --- in place whereof afterwards succeeded those that were for Ornament, and to signify such Vertues as were requisite in those Parties, that rightly used them. These are those Ceremonies, which before he told us, were only external Solemnities, and in some measure necessary Adjuncts of Worship, which are the only Ceremonies in dispute among us, and the Dissenters, which he calls Adjuncts and Solemnities as we do. He adds, 2. *Some are parts of the immediate Worship*, as Sacrifice, Prayer, Adoration, and such like; some only *disposits*, as Fasting, austerities, &c. : some are only *Instruments*, as Churches, Altars, Chalice, and all those, which religiously being separated, serve only to make the Worship more Solemn, and that Solemnity more Holy. So that tho he calls the whole external Worship, and every thing, that belongs to it, Ceremonies, and Acts of Religion, as having some relation to religious Actions, yet he expressly distinguishes between the Parts of Worship; and the external Adjuncts and Instruments of it, and therefore does not call

P. 58.



call our Ceremonies Acts of Worship, as that signifies a part of God's immediate Worship, but in a more lax sense, to include all external Adjuncts and Solemnities of Worship.

And therefore the Church of England never had any occasion to justify her Worship by such distinctions as the Church of Rome has invented of *Primary and Secondary, Agrum. p. 48. Essential and Accidental, Proper and Improper, Worship*, whereby they endeavour to justify that Worship, they pay to Saints and Angels, and Images; which we have no use of, because we Worship none but God. And our Author is a very pleasant Man, who would justify the Worship of Images, under the Notion of Ceremonies: surely the Church of England is not agreed with them here too; for we know no such Ceremonies as are the Objects of Worship, and that an Image is in the Church of Rome; we use some indifferent and significant Ceremonies in the Worship of God, but we do not worship our Ceremonies.

call our Ceremonies Acts of Worship, as that signifies a  
~~part of Gods inward Worship, but in a more lax~~  
~~sense, to include outward Actions and solemnities of~~  
~~Worship~~

### III. The AGREEMENT

occasion to justify his Worship by such distinctions as the

Church of Rome has its primary and secondary

Essential and accidental, proper and improper, Worship.

pay to Saints and Angels, and Images; which we have no

of because we Worship none but God. And our

Answer to  
 Papists Prot.  
 p 81.

forms his Argument from a Passage in the An-

swer to Papists, protesting against Protestant

Poper; and from another in the Discourse against Tran-

substantiation, p. 21. and from the Ceremony of Kneeling

at the receiving the Lords Supper. The Answerer says, that

to pay the External Acts of Adoration, to, or before, or in

Presence of a Representative Object of Worship, as Repre-

senting is the very same thing. In the Discourse against

Transubstantiation, it is observed, That the Doctrine of

the Corporal Presence of Christ, was started upon occasion of

the Dispute about the Worship of Images; in opposition where-

to the Synod of Constantinople, about the Tear of Christ,

750. did argue thus: That our Lord having left us no o-

ther Image of Himself, but the Sacrament in which the Sub-

stance of the Bread is the Image of his Body; we ought to

make no other Image of our Lord. In Answer to this Argu-

ment, the second Council of Nice in the Year 787. did De-

clare, That the Sacrament after Consecration is not the I-

mage and Antitype of Christs Body and Blood, but is pro-

perly his Body and Blood. And then the Church of Eng-

land has enjoyed Bowing or Kneeling at the Reception of

the Lords Supper, for a Signification of our humble and

grate-

grateful Acknowledgments of the Benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers; and for avoiding such Prophanation and Disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue.

From these Premises our Author thus Argues. So that Kneeling is Expressive of the inward Reverence of the Heart to Christ, and so is an Act of Religious Adoration; the Kneeling then before the Sacramental Sign, is the same with Kneeling to them; Bowing before them, is the same with Bowing to them; a Worshipping before them, the same with giving a Religious Worship to them. Which sufficiently shows, that in one great Instance the Church of England retains the same kind of Image Worship with the Roman-Catholics; and so far are we agreed with them.

In very good time! But there is one thing yet, remains to be proved, which he has conveniently dropt: And that is, That the Church of England owns the Sacramental Bread to be the Image of Christ, and the Representative Object of Worship: This he knew, he could not prove, and therefore says nothing of it, for it does not follow, that, because the Council of Constantinople affirmed, that the Sacramental Bread is the Image of Christ's Body; therefore the Church of England teaches so: I am sure, that Author say no such thing, and if we should allow it in some Sense to be the Image, as that signifies the Sacramental Figure of Christ's Body; Does it hence follow, that it is the Representative Object of Worship? And thus his *To*, and *before*, and *in Presence*, is all lost; because the Bread according to the Doctrine of the Church of England is no Representative Object of Worship, and therefore we neither Bow *To*, nor *before*, nor *in Presence* of the Bread, as a Representative Object; and therefore the Answer that Author gave,

R

that

*A Vindication of, &c.*

that we do not Kneel to the Sacrament, but receive it Kneeling, is a very good Answer still.

Thus I have considered all his Pretences of Agreement, between the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, which they are as unfortunate at, as they are at *Representing*: And methinks it Argues some distrust of their Cause, that they dare not down-right defend it, but are forced either to represent it away almost into Protestant Heresy, or to shelter themselves in their Agreement with a Protestant Church; but the better way is to turn Protestants themselves, and then we will own our Agreement with them.

---

**THE END.**

---

## Books lately Printed for Will. Rogers.

**T**HE Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome, truly Represented; in Answer to a Book intituled, *A Papiſt Miſrepreſented, and Represented*, &c. Quarto.

An Answer to a Diſcourſe intituled, *Papiſt, preſenting againſt Proteſtant Popery*; being a Vindication of Papiſts not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants: And containing a particular Examination of Monsieur de Meaux, late Biſhop of Condom, his Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, in the Articles of Invocation of Saints, Worſhip of Images, occaſioned by that Diſcourſe. Quarto.

An Answer to the *Amicable Accommodation* of the Difference, between the *Repreſenter* and the *Answerer*. Quarto.

A View of the whole Controverſie, between the *Repreſenter* and the *Answerer*; with an Answer to the *Repreſenter's* laſt Reply; in which are laid open ſome of the Methods, by which Proteſtants are Miſrepreſented by Papiſts. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the Trinity, and *Tranſubſtantiation*, compared as to *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *Tradition*; in a new Dialogue between a *Proteſtant* and a *Papiſt*, the firſt Part: Wherein an Answer is given to the late Proofs of the Antiquity of *Tranſubſtantiation*, in the Books called, *Conſenſus Veterum*, and *Nubes Teſtium*, &c. Quarto.

The Doctrine of the Trinity, and *Tranſubſtantiation*, compared as to *Scripture*, *Reason*, and *Tradition* in a new Dialogue between a *Proteſtant* and a *Papiſt*, the Second Part: Wherein the Doctrine of the Trinity is ſhewed to be agreeable, to *Scripture* and *Reason*, and *Tranſubſtantiation* repugnant to both, Quarto.

An Answer to the Eighth Chapter of the *Repreſenter's* Second Part, in the firſt Dialogue, between him and his Lay-Friend.

Of the Authority of *Councils*, and the Rule of *Faith*. By a Perſon of Quality: With an Answer to the Eight *Theſis*, laid down for the Tryal of the *Engliſh Reformation*; in a Book that came lately from Oxford.

Sev-